

**Washington**



**WASHINGTON STATE**

---

**ANNUAL REPORT ON**

**THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT TITLE I-B**

*Submitted by*

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board  
and Washington State Employment Security Department

December 6, 2002

---

## CONTENTS

### SECTION ONE. WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT IN WASHINGTON STATE

Introduction	
Background and Summary	1
Vision and Goals	1
State Structure	2
Local Structure	2
Summary of Results	3

### SECTION TWO. WHAT IS WORKING WELL

Introduction	5
Workforce Development Council Highlights	5-18
State Highlights	
Introduction	19
Worksource	19
Improving Worksource Services and Outcomes for People with Disabilities	19
Skies Implementation	20
Statewide Rapid Response	21
Update to the State's Strategic Plan	22
Eligible Training Provider List	22
Targeting Workforce Resources for Economic Vitality	23
Workforce Development Council Re-Certification	23
Fall 2001 Workforce Conference	24
Dislocated Worker Symposium 2001	24
Statewide Activities Summary	24-25

### SECTION THREE. WIA TITLE I-B RESULTS

Analysis	27
Cost Effectiveness	28
Evaluation Activities	29
Employment Results	30
Earnings Results	31
Net Impact and Cost-Benefit Evaluation	32
Comments on Proposed Federal Core Indicators	34
Measures Unique to Youth and Lifelong Learning Programs	36
Tables (Narrative)	37
Tables	39-58

**WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (WIA) IN WASHINGTON STATE** —▼

**Introduction**

The federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) was signed into law in August 1998 and became effective in Washington state on July 1, 2000. This summary report focuses on second year accomplishments in Washington to implement WIA Title I-B services.

For the second year (July 2001 through June 2002) the United States Department of Labor (DOL) allocated \$70 million in WIA Title I-B funds to Washington. These funds continued employment and training services designed to benefit employers, dislocated workers, adults and low income youth.

This report describes how WIA Title I-B is organized in Washington State, highlights local and state accomplishments, and concludes with WIA Title I-B performance results.

**Background and Summary**

*Workforce Development System Vision and Goals*

Washington’s 2000 State Strategic Plan for Workforce Development was updated and adopted by the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board on May 30, 2002. The plan entitled “High Skills, High Wages: Our Agenda for Action 2002” communicates our state’s vision, goals, objectives and strategies for the workforce development system. WIA Title I-B programs are a critical part of realizing this vision and accomplishing our state’s workforce development goals. In order to assure that the state’s directions were set and roles were clear, Governor Locke issued Executive Order 99-02 in September 1999.

**VISION**

*Our vision is a workforce development system that offers every Washingtonian access to high quality academic and occupational skills education throughout his or her lifetime, effective help to find work or training when unemployed, and the personalized assistance to make progress in the labor market.*

**GOALS**

*Goal 1*

To close the gap between the need of the employers for skilled workers and the supply of Washington residents prepared to meet that need.

*Goal 2*

To enable workers to make smooth transitions so that they and their employers may fully benefit from the new, changing economy by putting in place a coherent strategy for dislocated and incumbent worker training.

*Goal 3*

To assist disadvantaged youth, persons with disabilities, new labor market entrants, recent immigrants, and other low wage workers to move up the job ladder during their lifetimes by developing a wage progression strategy for low-income workers. Specific progress will be made in improving operating agencies and reducing the earnings gap facing people of color, people with disabilities, and women.

*Goal 4*

To integrate workforce development programs to improve customer service.

### State Structure

The Governor and the Legislature created the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) in 1991 to coordinate policy planning and accountability for the state's workforce development system. The Workforce Board also serves as the state Workforce Investment Board and manages the performance accountability for WIA. The Workforce Board develops and approves the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and facilitates the coordination of workforce development programs including WIA Title I-B, vocational-technical education, adult education and family literacy, vocational rehabilitation, apprenticeship, and private career schools. The state Workforce Board and the Employment Security Department work collaboratively on WIA Title I-B. The Workforce Board also works with state operating agencies and local area Workforce Development Councils to ensure a link between workforce and economic development strategies.

The Washington State Employment Security Department (ESD) has administrative responsibility for the WIA Title I-B youth, adult, and dislocated worker grants. It also has management and oversight responsibility for WIA Title I-B Statewide Activities Funds. Among other things, the Statewide Activities Funds support the Governor's continuing interest in addressing critical health care shortages, developing strategies to keep kids in school and enable them to enter careers or continue education, improving access to services for persons with disabilities, and in linking workforce development to economic development.

The Department is the lead state agency for the operation of WorkSource, the state's One-Stop employment and training service delivery system. In Program Year 2001, the WorkSource Operations Division of the Employment Security Department focused on three strategic areas to improve WorkSource services:

- ◆ Reemployment services for unemployment insurance claimants.

- ◆ Job seeker services for all people seeking employment assistance.
- ◆ Services to Businesses for companies seeking assistance.



### The WorkSource Vision:

*The One-Stop Career Development System (WorkSource) is the trusted source of employment and training services in Washington State. A comprehensive network of state and local programs meets customer needs and offers seamless, high quality service. A common look and feel to the system make it familiar and easily accessed wherever it is located.*

### Local Structure

There are 12 local area Workforce Development Councils, one for each of the state's 12 workforce development areas (see map on page 5). Each Council, in consultation with chief local elected officials, oversees WIA Title I-B activities, coordinates local area workforce development services, and provides outreach to employers. The Councils use their leadership to ensure a link with local economic development strategies. Each Council has a Governor-approved local Unified Plan that includes a strategic plan that assesses local employment opportunities and skill needs, and sets forth goals, objectives, and strategies for the local workforce development system consistent with the state strategic goals (see page 1). The strategic role of local Workforce Development Councils makes them the counterpart to the state Workforce Board at the local level. Given this responsibility, an entirely new state-to-local and local-to-state set of relationships has been formed.

### *Summary of Results*

During the second year of WIA (July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002), Washington's performance was very successful. WorkSource is on the way to meeting the challenge of providing universal access while serving the workforce development needs of special populations. From July 2001 through May 2002, WorkSource served over 321,000 customers seeking employment and other services. Approximately 208,000 of these individuals found employment. Job seekers and employers link to the WorkSource website at: [www.go2worksource.com](http://www.go2worksource.com). The use of this self-service labor exchange website has increased dramatically. Comparing the month of June 2001, to the month of May 2002, individual user sessions went from 99,400 to 195,000 and job searches, using the website, jumped from 620,000 to 908,000.

For customers needing a more intensive level of service, 18,726 participants were served in WIA Title I-B programs between July 2001 and June 2002. Washington's high levels of performance under WIA continued upward in Program Year 2001. Washington performed at an average of 104% of our targets for 17 federal performance measures, 132% of our targets for nine state measures, and 114% of the 26 measures overall. Despite negotiated performance levels set at 105% of the average targets for other states, Washington exceeded its average federal targets in all program areas:

- ◆ Adults- 101%;
- ◆ Dislocated Workers- 103%;
- ◆ Youth- 106%; and
- ◆ Customer Satisfaction-105%.


## WHAT IS WORKING WELL

### Introduction

Washington's workforce development system is dedicated to providing quality services to all individuals seeking training, employment, job retention, or increased earnings and for employers seeking qualified workers. Washington's twelve Workforce Development Council's (WDCs) are working with WorkSource partner agencies to provide a comprehensive menu of professional services. This section provides, in their own words, short summaries of unique workforce development services and leadership activities coordinated by each of the twelve local Councils. This section also includes highlights of state-level leadership activities and services on Program Year 2001 (July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002).

### Workforce Development Council Highlights

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AREAS





Serving Clallam, Kitsap, and Jefferson counties

## OLYMPIC WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### Local Partnerships

The Olympic Workforce Development Council (Olympic Consortium) actively works and partners with local agencies to promote economic vitality in Kitsap, Clallam and Jefferson counties. This partnership resulted in a state economic development award to the Olympic Consortium, the Kitsap Regional Economic Development Council (EDC), the Olympic College, the city of Bremerton and Kitsap Transit. The award recognized the partnership's work in promoting Kitsap County as the employment solution and best property location for a private company's quest to establish a 500-employee call center.

The Kitsap WorkSource Center purchased special software to assess and prescreen 2,300 applicants for necessary skills and provided the company office and training space during its construction period. The Kitsap Regional EDC showed the company property sites, the Olympic College provided training space, and Kitsap Transit arranged for transportation. A \$30,000 grant from the Kitsap County Community Development Block Grant program was also a part of this effort.

### WorkSource Implementation

The Olympic Consortium is working with the two local community colleges (Peninsula and Olympic), and community-based organizations (Kitsap Community Resources, Sound Works, and Olympic Community Action Programs), to expand employment and training services in the three county area. This collaborative effort resulted in two new WorkSource affiliate sites in Kitsap County and a new WorkSource Center in Jefferson County. The Jefferson County WorkSource Center offers a unique opportunity for job seekers to work with the Washington State University (WSU) Cooperative Extension Office (CEO), which is located in the same building.

The WSU program offers greater opportunities for Jefferson County job seekers to find employment and engage in training programs. The new Center houses WIA, Trade Adjustment Act (TAA), labor exchange, and veterans employment services and programs. It also houses a non-profit organization, the Olympic Community Action Program.

### Employer Services

The Olympic Consortium business outreach efforts have included:

- ◆ Conducting a business information survey with Jefferson and Clallam Chambers of Commerce and Economic Development Councils.

- ◆ Furnishing WorkSource Center business and employer resource rooms which provide interviewing space, assessment equipment, brochures, and Chamber of Commerce and Small Business Administration information. Customized assessment for local businesses has also been provided.
- ◆ Co-sponsoring job fair events in each county. Coordinating these events with Puget Sound Energy, *The Leader Newspaper*, the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce and Jefferson EDC, the Clallam EDC, and Peninsula and Olympic Colleges.
- ◆ Initiating and staffing the HealthCare Alliance Industry skills panel.
- ◆ Partnering with Nextel, the Kitsap Regional EDC, and the Olympic College on a three-month hiring event. Over 2,300 applicants were tested and 500 job seekers hired. This partnership is ongoing.
- ◆ Coordinating five industry cluster analyses and action plans as part of a five-county regional economic planning effort started by the local EDCs.

### Youth Services

The 11th adaptation of the Lincoln School project was effectively carried out last year. Successful collaboration has been ongoing since 1996, involving the Northwest Services Council, the Carpenter's Union, and the Clallam County Historical Society. Twelve WIA youth began this project. Seven completed their 12-week pre-apprenticeship in carpentry and construction while working to renovate the building that will become the Society's Historical Museum.

In the summer of 2001, 12 Clallam County WIA youth participated in the first SKY (Service, Knowledge, Youth) program on the Olympic Peninsula. This collaboration involved the Northwest Services Council, the Pacific Northwest Trail Association, and local school districts. The youth worked on the Spruce Railroad Trail on Lake Crescent and earned science and English credits by completing the SKY curriculum. The program was quite successful and will be expanded to include Jefferson County.

Olympic Educational Services District 114 operates the Kitsap County WIA youth program, *Pathways to Success*. The youth program staff works collaboratively with community organizations and businesses and focuses on issues facing Kitsap County youth. Staff provides training in CPR, flagging, fork-lift operation, certified nursing, medical insurance billing, and conflict resolution. Sixty-nine businesses and agencies provide work experience opportunities for WIA youth.



## PACIFIC MOUNTAIN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### *WorkSource Implementation*


The Pacific Mountain Workforce Development Council (Pacific Mountain) was honored this year by the International Association of Personnel of Employment Security (IAPES) for advancing workforce development, specifically in the area of one-stop center development. The WorkSource Grays Harbor Center received the IAPES award for the best one-stop center in the country. The evaluation process concentrated on the topics of universal access, customer choice, and service integration. In all three topics of the evaluation, the IAPES organization found WorkSource Grays Harbor worthy of recognition.

### *Employer Services*

Program Year 2001 has been a remarkable year for Pacific Mountain and has resulted in many successes. In September of 2001, a simple invitation to speak to the Southwest Washington Hospital Administrators' Council resulted in a very productive partnership. Due to the need to fill critical healthcare worker shortages and Pacific Mountain's commitment to the employer community, a partnership was formed. With funding assistance from the Workforce Board, the Pacific Mountain Healthcare SKILLS Panel was formed. This partnership consists of hospital administrators, technical practitioners, educators (both secondary and post-secondary), labor and a variety of other interested parties.

Initial efforts of the SKILLS Panel resulted in the development of a survey instrument and an in-depth assessment of employment gaps of the area's health care providers. As part of this project, a plan was developed to remove the barriers identified to meeting the skill shortages and recommendations were developed for the utilization of training resources and budget considerations. Because of this partnership, funds were secured from the Employment Security Department (Industries of the Future) to provide incumbent worker training in the health care industry.

The Industries of the Future project was developed in cooperation with the Providence Health Care System, the South Puget Sound Community College, the Service Employees International Union Local 6 and Pacific Mountain. The successful proposal resulted in 25 Providence



*Serving Grays Harbor, Mason, Lewis, Thurston and Pacific counties*

employees in Olympia and Centralia being upgraded from Certified Nursing Assistants (CNAs) to Licensed Practical Nurses (LPNs), and LPNs being upgraded to Registered Nurses. The project is proving to be highly successful and extremely beneficial to the Providence Health Care System and the area workforce.

### *Special Initiatives*

2001 has provided many opportunities to expand Pacific Mountain services for the disability community. A pilot project was launched in partnership with the state's Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) to deliver pre-employment services to DVR clients. In addition, an award to the Washington Workforce Association, of which Pacific Mountain is a member, will fund Pacific Mountain's Business Assistance Project to advance employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.



## NORTHWEST WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

The Northwest Workforce Development Council (NWDC) completed Program Year 2001 as a maturing one-stop system with many successes and new challenges, including local plant closures and a rising unemployment rate.

### *Local Partnerships*

Growth of our maturing one-stop system is evident in local partnership efforts to manage performance through the development of a competency-based workforce system. The Northwest Partnership for Workforce Development undertook a critical examination of professional core competencies in workforce development. After adopting twelve core competencies, the Partnership developed indicators and a two-level system of measures for each. The partners individually examined how they would implement the competencies with their workforce development professionals. Commitments included use in: recruitment, staff development, staff evaluations, and staff recognition. The Partnership will next participate in a pilot of on-line learning for each of the professional competencies.

### *Employer Services*

The Northwest Partnership continued to strengthen and expand its relationship and relevance with the area's business community. WorkSource Northwest Career Centers hosted forums and seminars of importance to the area's economy. These included a regional issues forum with U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell, monthly Business LINC roundtable forums, employer tax planning seminars, new business outreach, as well as, small business startup, operation, and marketing seminars. The Council is active in area-wide, comprehensive economic development planning, industry sector and cluster research, and alignment of changing workplace skill needs with the area's training providers.

### *Youth Services*

Youth programs continue to receive the full attention of the Council. A community-wide resource mapping project of youth resources was initiated to create a regional, data-driven, long-term, strategic plan for youth services. The Council's youth programs

provide the ten key elements of service, with an emphasis on work-based learning opportunities. A long-term partnership with five school districts and the Washington State Parks Department has created an award winning *learning through work* community for at-risk students. To expand quality work-based learning opportunities for local students, the Deception Pass Park project was initiated in 1997. This project created a multifaceted, integrated program that met a public need and provided opportunity for students to develop workplace skills. Additionally, the connection between school and work was strengthened, or in some cases, created. Additional partnerships with the U.S. Forest Service and the Pacific Northwest Trail Association led to the development of two more project-based learning programs. Each youth project site offered: basic skills enhancement, work readiness with the connection to a career pathway, and portfolio development. Project goals were: high school retention, credit catch-up, high school completion, GED or entry into post-high school activities. Our collaborative youth project model has been replicated in Port Angeles and Port Townsend.

The Northwest's sectoral initiative in health and allied services quickly moved from the formation stage to implementation. The creation of a new *Radiologic Technology* program was accomplished through a collaboration of six colleges in the region. Additionally, nursing career ladder opportunities were created, including training for incumbent, low-skill, low-wage workers leading to skill certification and increased wages. A broad regional collaborative approach with three adjacent Workforce Investment Boards addressing health care skills gaps led to an H1-B grant award to further coordinate and support the skills needed to attract and advance workers in nursing careers.

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL**



*Local Partnerships*

As a result of the *dot.com* industry economic downturn, WorkSource Lynnwood created a Professional Networking Group (PNG) of Information Technology (IT) professionals. These highly skilled professionals confronted significant obstacles in finding suitable re-employment. The PNG allowed group members to identify their strengths while providing peer support. Ongoing networking continued even after the group members found employment. This group was recognized by the Governor's Office for a Best Practice Award. To date, the PNG has 174 active members and has added accountants, trainers, teachers, engineers and other professionals to utilize the PNG networking model.

WorkSource Everett, in conjunction with Edmonds and Everett Community Colleges, formed a partnership along with the healthcare industry providers of Snohomish County to develop a regional training system for professional and technical healthcare occupations. Shortages in registered nurses and other professional/technical healthcare occupations are expected to dramatically increase by the year 2020. As a result, a Snohomish County healthcare industry/training provider advisory panel was formed to identify skills gaps, monitor current unmet labor demand and predict emerging needs. Outcomes have resulted in a mentor training approach, development of an access database to provide networking information, and weekly meetings conducted by volunteers rotating this responsibility. Training opportunities have been expanded: programs between the two colleges have been coordinated; training for incumbent and unemployed job seekers has been added; and additional resources to sustain these efforts has been generated. A grant for \$800,000 was obtained to train Snohomish County incumbent workers in healthcare occupations. WorkSource provided \$250,000 to local community colleges to increase capacity of healthcare training facilities and the colleges now teach a variety of classes at the two WorkSource centers.

*Employer Services*

In addition to establishing a provisional WorkSource affiliate site at Boeing's Career Transition Center, the following employer services were accomplished during the past program year. The Snohomish WDC conducted:

- ◆ Contract training for the companies of Kimberley-Clark (incumbent workers), Verizon and AT&T using a \$554,000 grant with a 100 percent private sector match. Additional contract training is in discussion with Eldec, Intermec, BF Goodrich, Morgan Aerospace, the Public Utility District, ATL, Providence and Stevens Hospitals, and a consortium of 20 plus printing and plastics manufacturing companies.
- ◆ A four-month needs assessment of employers combined with a data analysis of high wage jobs, target employers by growth sector, and skills pool areas, resulting in the development of a targeted industry business plan.
- ◆ Monthly job fairs with high attendance by employers and job seekers, high customer satisfaction reports from both sectors.
- ◆ They also released a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking collaborative efforts in construction trades which includes local nonprofits engaged in building public housing or addressing community needs.

*Youth Services*

The WDC secured one of 17 One-Stop Enhancement Grants for \$20,000 increasing youth connections to the WorkSource system which resulted in the acquisition of a Young Offenders Grant (one of only 28 nationally). The Youth Council hosted a stakeholders meeting addressing the needs of youth offenders resulting in the WDC, Juvenile Courts and other agencies, acquiring this \$1.5 million Young Offenders Grant. Known as Project REACH, 5 youth self-service sites will be certified. Other noteworthy youth services accomplishments included:

- ◆ Providing all county school districts with an apprenticeship toolkit assisting youth in career exploration, as well as assisting numerous career specialists with career fairs in high schools.
- ◆ Conducting an Apprenticeship Network launch through a countywide apprenticeship fair and outreach in schools resulting in significant outcomes and placements.
- ◆ Providing eight classroom grants to teachers integrating applied learning techniques in classrooms.

## SEATTLE-KING COUNTY WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### *Local Partnerships*

Among the most successful partnerships of the Workforce Development Council (WDC) are the public-private workgroups in the construction, health care, hospitality, and manufacturing industries. These industry panels have successfully convened representatives from business, labor, and community and technical colleges to solve workforce problems together. Although many of these representatives had never met around the same table before, they quickly began developing solutions. A recruitment and marketing campaign to attract women, minorities, and low-wage workers to the building trades is just one example of what they accomplished. In health care, where the worker shortage is at a crisis point, hospitals and community colleges identified ways to expand the training capacity of the colleges and to move low-wage health care workers into high-demand jobs, supported by WDC funding. In manufacturing, the WDC will fund Shoreline Community College to work with employers to further define skill standards, reform college training courses, and set up centers to assess the skills of incumbent workers and training graduates. The program is the result of recommendations made by a panel of manufacturers, community and technical colleges and others.

### *Employer Services*

The WDC has focused the efforts of the WorkSource system on meeting employer needs, believing this is the best way to meet the needs of the disadvantaged of King County. This realignment of the system's priorities led the board to accomplish the following three major changes:

- ◆ Increasing employer presence and involvement on the board. Currently nine of the sixteen members of the Executive Committee are from the private sector.
- ◆ Employing two business services leads to serve as employers' contacts at the WorkSource centers.



- ◆ Launching sectoral strategies to alleviate skills gaps in specific industries. These strategies include developing partnerships and initiatives in construction, manufacturing, health care, hospitality, and information technology industries.

### *Youth Services*

A summer pilot project, called Strengthening Programs through Youth Consultation and Evaluation (SPYCE) trained youth to perform an in-depth assessment of WDC youth programs. The ten youth evaluators from WIA and Youth Opportunity received mentoring, occupational skills training and leadership development opportunities. They administered surveys, led focus groups, and conducted interviews with close to 1,000 youth across Seattle-King County. The qualitative information they gathered will enable the WDC to identify effective strategies that will help youth succeed. SPYCE's success has laid the ground work for an ongoing youth-driven evaluation system.

### *Other Innovations*

In addition to building and improving the WorkSource system, the WDC expanded our role as an organizer of stakeholders, a resource for the community, and a policy initiator on workforce issues.

In addition, our WDC is the first in the country to organize a research and development committee to explore long-term trends and develop long-term strategies for our local workforce. The goal of the committee is to change our economy for the better over the next 20 years. Some issues identified by the committee include examining immigration as a workforce asset, connecting industry and education, and increasing coordination with economic development.

Also, the WDC established a self-sufficiency standard developed by researchers for Washington State. This tool will help customers set goals and measure their success based on progress towards self-sufficiency, rather than by their wages alone.

**TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL**



*Local Partnerships*

In PY 2001, the Pierce County emphasis was refining and extending last year's lessons learned. In some instances, that meant bringing in new partners. In other instances, it meant working more closely with partners to clarify goals and extend efforts towards these goals. Our strategic initiatives took several avenues. For example, a Casey Family Program partnership provides employment and education services to youth "aging out" of the foster care system. In 2000, the Pierce County WDC began a relationship with Casey to better support these youth, combining WIA, Welfare-to-Work and private funds. To allow participants to focus on job readiness and training while gaining work experience, the GREAT program uses existing and emerging community resources and funding and provides key comprehensive services, such as: assessing each youths' individual needs; providing case management including independent living services; and advocating for youth in out-of-home care. The partnership serves 50 youth annually and has been recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor, National Corrections Institute, and Washington State Employment Security Department.

The WDC strategic initiatives group and the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) established another partnership to increase workforce development core and intensive services for offenders and their families. Funded by DOC, Welfare-to-Work and WIA funds for a total of \$390,000, DOC funds purchased additional computers and other resources to extend core services for DOC customers at the WorkSource Career Development Center (CDC). These funds also increased WorkSource staffing for all customers including increasing free CDC workshops and other services such as, driver license reinstatement, consumer credit counseling, cognitive and behavioral change skills training, and Division of Child Support guidance. To date, 500 offenders have received workforce development services. DOC is acquiring space at its Community Justice Center and plans to upgrade this space to become a new WorkSource Pierce affiliate site by early 2003. The partnership has been recognized as a best practice by the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Labor and Washington State Employment Security Department.

*Employer Services*

The Pierce County WorkSource system merged employer representatives from its various agencies into one location. Employer representatives now coordinate Pierce County employer services, reducing duplicate contacts. These representatives also host employer events that bring employers together with job seekers while focusing on high-demand industries. A single point of contact for employer services supports the flexibility to provide many resources to one employer. As an example, the Ironworkers Apprenticeship program funded by the workforce system will contribute to the Narrows Bridge construction project when implemented.

With this approach, employer service representatives can also enhance job seeker services. At this year's annual job fair 45 vendors met 2,100 job seekers. A week prior to the job fair, employer services staff held a day-long *Ready, Set, Go to Work* workshop for job seekers including WIA program participants. It included a local sports announcer, Tony Ventralla, as a motivational speaker and other workshops on dress, interviewing, how to look for jobs, and of course, how to use a job fair.

*Youth Services*

The Youth Council of the WDC is revising its strategic plan based on a better understanding of the implications of WIA. The Council has allocated a full staff position to supporting its seven youth affiliates in addressing the ten core elements of youth services, plus maintaining compliance with youth performance levels. Staff now holds quarterly meetings with all youth service providers and provides training in performance indicators and use the SKIES system. The Council is also reviewing equitable service distribution between urban and rural youth and their school districts.

## SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL


### *Local Partnerships*

The past year was eventful for the Southwest Washington Workforce Development Council (SWWDC). Both the board and staff busied themselves with a myriad of activities leading up to the July 1, 2002, transition of the organization into two separate entities: the Southwest Washington Workforce Development Council and Partners In Careers (PIC). This move was designed to help establish the WDC as the strategic leader for workforce development issues in Clark, Cowlitz, Skamania, and Wahkiakum counties, while allowing Partners In Careers to focus on providing quality training and employment services in Clark County, as well as serving as the host agency for WorkSource West Vancouver, a one-stop center.

Milestones included incorporating and restructuring the SWWDC; recruiting and selecting a new Executive Director; selecting a local Certified Public Account (CPA) firm as the fiscal agent; and planning for relocation to downtown Vancouver. SWWDC will share office space with the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Columbia River Economic Development Council, and other local organizations with similar interests. Board members volunteered countless hours serving on the Transition Steering Committee and other ad hoc subcommittees such as Recruitment and Facilities.

### *WorkSource Implementation*

Our local One-stop Partnership invested considerable time assessing its implementation progress and the functionality of its organizational structure. It also shared continuous improvement strategies suggested by customer comments throughout the system. An ad hoc disabilities team visited all of our one-stop centers and affiliates to determine how they could improve their services for persons with disabilities. Their findings resulted in the purchase of needed assistive devices and equipment. This year's activities also included: ongoing implementation of the Services, Knowledge and Information Exchange System (SKIES) participant data tracking system; planning for an upcoming system to track self-service activity throughout our one-stop system; and a variety of activities to prepare for next year's recertification of the centers and affiliates.



Our workforce investment system assisted hundreds of adult and dislocated worker job seekers and trainees throughout Southwest Washington to access needed training and secure employment in a variety of demand occupations and industries. As a result of the surveyed needs of laid off workers, rapid response dislocated worker services were provided at the employees' work sites.


### *Employer Services*

During the transition period, the Southwest Washington WDC continued its important work towards addressing critical workforce issues and trends and planning the coming year's activities and new initiatives with key industries and employers throughout our four-county area. Efforts to secure funding for projects, such as formation of a regional Allied Health Care Skills Panel and Lean Manufacturing Training for a local high tech employer, were also successful.

### *Youth Services*

Our WIA youth programs continued to work on dropout prevention and finding innovative ways to engage youth in high demand and high wage training and employment opportunities. Programs focused on intensive year round programming; academic achievement; alignment with state education requirements; post-secondary readiness; and long-term outcomes. Emphasis was placed on meeting each youth's needs and continuity of services. Specific services available included: tutoring; study skills; alternative secondary school services; summer employment opportunities directly linked to academic and occupational learning; paid and unpaid work experiences (including internships and job shadowing); and occupational skill training, including classroom and on-the-job training; leadership development; adult mentoring; guidance and counseling (including drug and alcohol abuse counseling and referral); supportive services; and follow-up services for at least a year following completion of the youth's individual program goals were also provided. Efforts were also focused on increasing connections to employers.

## NORTH CENTRAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL



### Local Partnerships

Samaritan Hospital and Skill Source have built a partnership dedicated to teaching the value of hands-on learning. Trainees learn valuable workplace skills and expand their career options in a high-demand industry. The goal has been to increase awareness of the opportunities in the medical industry, train for entry-level positions, and encourage further education for careers requiring higher level skills.

The new Career Exploration Mentorship program is one example of partnership at its best. Last year, eight students participated in this pilot project. To prepare, the students spent two weeks in the classroom researching different medical occupations and using assessment tools to gauge their interests and abilities. Then the students were on their way to Samaritan Hospital to begin their hands-on learning. Students were matched with mentors in various departments throughout the hospital to show them the ropes. Each student spent two hours each week learning from their mentor. The initial pilot was so successful that a second Mentorship program is set to begin in October 2002. This round will allow for more one-on-one time between the SkillSource student and the Samaritan mentor. Samaritan also trains and hires adult students in a variety of positions, such as admitting clerk, business services receptionist, office assistant, mammography receptionist and certified nurse's assistant.

### Employer Services

One of the North Central WDC's top priorities is to better engage and serve local businesses. This past year SkillSource:

- ◆ Engaged businesses in a series of roundtable discussions about their workplace productivity issues.
- ◆ Identified top challenges facing area employers.
- ◆ Designed new services to meet employer needs. Examples include supervisor training, customized training to address skills gaps experienced by incumbent workers, and salary surveys that help businesses stay competitive.

- ◆ Facilitated the delivery of information and services through coordination with partners and business organizations. In addition, a quarterly luncheon was held which targeted local area businesses. The purpose of the luncheon was to promote worker training and development in order to increase workplace productivity.

The WDC is continuing a training program it piloted. This training program transforms low-skilled, often limited English speaking workers (heading for job obsolescence) into skilled technicians prepared for career advancement in food processing technology. Companies in Moses Lake and Othello are sending entry-level workers to take special SkillSource assessments and introductory workshops. These assessments are used to determine a worker's aptitude and interest in climbing the career ladder from machine operator to equipment repairer. Big Bend Community College, in response to a need identified by the WDC, is now holding classes on Friday for these incumbent worker trainees. Classes include training such as the basics of electrical safety and systems, maintenance of mechanical equipment, process control systems, hydraulics, and refrigeration.

### Youth Services

SkillSource conducted the first *Career Quest* youth conference co-sponsored by Wenatchee Valley College. The theme of the event was *Explore Your Future, Expand Your Mind*. Nearly 50 businesses turned out to answer questions, and just as many donated countless prizes for raffles, drawings, and contests. Roughly 300 students heard from local businesses about what jobs will be like ten years from now, as well as what companies really expect today and how to prepare for the high-paying jobs of tomorrow. Experts shared from first-hand experience, how to find out if a career in the medical field is the right choice, or how to be your own boss, and what it takes to accomplish either. The students played a major role in the conference. They presented over 15 displays of the work they had accomplished. One of these displays now hangs at the city's Riverfront Ice Arena depicting the Apple Capital Loop Trail.

## TRI-COUNTY WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### *Local Partnerships*

The Tri-County Workforce Development Council has taken a leadership role in conducting a community audit in Yakima, Kittitas, and Klickitat Counties. This audit allows local stakeholders to take a broad look at the real and perceived needs of the community, characterize the present and future workforce, and analyze research available on the current and emerging local economy. The audit will enable the Council to create strategies and further refine the strategic plan for workforce and community development in the Tri-County area and serve as the basis for local policy decisions. Further, the audit will be a valuable resource for incorporating workforce issues with other strategic planning initiatives in the communities.

### *WorkSource Implementation*

The large majority of visitors to our WorkSource centers and affiliate sites come in to avail themselves of many “self-service” tools/services such as computer usage for resume development, Internet job search, fax machine and copier usage, accessing resource rooms and participating in job clubs. Because of the self-service nature of these tools/services, it has been difficult to track how many people are taking advantage of them, or which services were most popular or useful. As a result, the WorkSource oversight committee of the Council developed an Internet-based *WorkSource Tracking System*. Using magnetically encoded swipe cards issued on their first visit, customers sign-in and record which service(s) they use each visit. While participation is voluntary, we find that most of our visitors are eager to participate. They value having the *membership card*, and are eager to help us learn how to better serve them. Now we have better information to help us report to stakeholders and the community regarding the services available and used in our WorkSource lobbies. In addition, we now have significant and timely management information to assist staff and organize the resource rooms in response to continuous customer improvements.

### *Employer Services*

Staying competitive in a global economy requires business to develop new products, to adopt new practices, and implement new processes. This means incumbent workers too, must change and learn new skills to keep their



industry strong. The strategy not only helps local industries stay healthy, but, helps workers upgrade skills, avert layoffs, increase earnings, achieve promotions and earn industry-recognized credentials.

The Tri-County Workforce Council has coordinated the incumbent worker training program with the Eastern Washington Agriculture and Food Processing Partnership. This nationally recognized model of collaborative leadership and integration of public and private resources addresses skill shortages while creating a training system based on industry skill standards. This innovative partnership was created to meet employers' needs to train incumbent workers in two of Washington's largest and most labor-intensive industries - food processing and farming.

This customer-driven sector initiative has shown tremendous results since January 2001 by:

- ◆ Creating 28 customized training courses offering certification and opportunities for specific career advancement.
- ◆ Delivering 43 training events for more than 32 companies at 70 work sites.
- ◆ Exceeding the Governor's goal of training 400 employees by more than 75 percent, ultimately providing 815 training slots for current workers.
- ◆ Achieving trainee wage increases due to increased productivity. Workers earned an additional \$300 to \$600 over a four-month period following training.

### *Youth Services*

The healthcare personnel shortage in the Tri-County area is real and mirrors what is occurring across Washington State. To address future needs, it is critical that youth are encouraged and provided opportunities to explore these healthcare careers. One strategy implemented by the Tri-County Youth Council was to introduce youth to the world of healthcare occupations through a Healthcare Careers Website ([www.healthcarecareers.org](http://www.healthcarecareers.org)). This site, tailored to the Tri-County area, provides youth the opportunity to explore careers in the healthcare field, match a job to their unique talents and personality, as well as review what health related occupations are available based on their current and future education levels. Listed on the site are the fastest growing health care occupations along with the names of prospective employers.



## EASTERN WASHINGTON PARTNERSHIP WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### *Local Partnerships*

Workforce development partners in the Eastern Washington Partnership (EWP) had several positive developments in the last year. One that was selected as a best practice included an involved process that led to the Washington Dental Services (WDS) expanding its telecenter services from Puget Sound to the Colville area. WDS needed to expand its offices due to its growing business and began to consider where to locate another office. The WDS management was aware of Washington State University's (WSU) Rural Telework project that was promoting the beneficial aspects for businesses with heavy reliance on telecommunication to consider locations in rural areas. The Chairman of WSU's Cooperative Extension Office in Colville had been participating in the rural telework meetings. The Chairman had already convened a group of local people in the Colville area whose focus was to expand the telecommunications capabilities in Stevens County.

The Director of the Tri-County Economic Development District (TEDD) in Colville had secured a grant from the Economic Development Administration in 2001 to assist in purchasing a building that could be leased to a new business or businesses. TEDD also secured a QWEST rate settlement grant in 2001 that would pay for the fiber optic lines that were needed for telephone redundancy in Stevens County.

The WDS anonymously began to inquire about Colville's ability to meet the various requirements it would need if it were to locate its new office in Colville. The WSU Chairman and the Director of TEDD then convened the administrators from the Colville WorkSource office and the Community Colleges of Spokane-Colville Center to address the questions about the nature of the local workforce and the availability of training. Each of the partners was able to provide quick and favorable responses to the list of WDS issues. The company considered the Colville option with great deliberation because it was quite a departure from its present business mode. In the end, WDS selected Colville and the company has been thoroughly satisfied with its choice. They attributed their decision to the ability of the local partnership to help make a business case that met all of their



criteria. Now, Colville has 35 new well-paying jobs with the prospect of an additional 30 jobs next year.

In another partnership, the EWP received funding for an Industries of the Future project forged between the Walla Walla Community College, Iowa Beef Products and Broetje Orchards in Walla Walla County to upgrade the skills of the companies' incumbent workers. This partnership will result in better job skills and more career advancement opportunities for the workers, and greater job retention prospects for the employers.

### *WorkSource Implementation*

In April of 2002, the Colville WorkSource partners co-located in a new building that was purchased by Rural Resources, the local community action agency. In addition to housing staff from Employment Security, Rural Resources employment staff, and staff from the state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, it also offers more than 40 other services including Head Start, transportation, low-income weatherization, energy assistance, legal services, services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and many more.

### *Youth Services*

The EWP Youth Council supported two projects that had youth service providers working hand-in-hand with staff from the juvenile justice system to identify and work with youth offenders as they were exiting from detention centers. They targeted youth who were needing to work but who also needed to get re-engaged with the school system. The project has proved to be very difficult but has opened up a new approach for offering troubled teens a better chance to change their behavior patterns.

## SPOKANE AREA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

### *Local Partnerships*

The second year of WIA implementation was marked by the continuation of program service provision and performance, continued development of council capacity, and activation of successful community partnerships. Core, intensive, and training services were provided to over 2,100 registered WIA customers. Career Path Services, Educational Services District #101, and the Washington State Employment Security Department (WorkSource office) continued to provide quality services. Quality services, meeting federal and state standards, and utilization of resources were highly commended and recognized in state reports and Quarterly Management Reviews. The Dislocated Worker program became the largest of the three WIA funded programs with over 800 individuals registered.

The Spokane Area WDC also participated in the One-Spokane Summit, the Mayor's anti-poverty campaign, and the successful application for the Community Empowerment Zone with the Spokane Area Economic Development Council. These initiatives and WIA are mutually supportive efforts to better the local workforce. They will have long-term impacts on Spokane.

### *WorkSource Implementation*

The WorkSource Center and our six affiliate sites continued to expand facilities and capacity to provide services to the universal customer. The number of customers served more than doubled as individuals became more aware of services and as the economy experienced a downturn. Regular Operations Committee meetings were held to discuss system issues. A regular Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process is in place.

The Spokane Area WDC continued to meet to acknowledge and organize for its broader workforce development systems role. Nomination procedures were developed to recognize the important role of various industry sector representation. Council roles and responsibilities, membership expectations, and job descriptions were developed. Committees and a taskforce were formed. Effective partnerships were formed and an annual meeting calendar was developed.



### *Employer Services*


In 2001, partnerships were developed to address both tactical and more strategic issues. In partnership with WorkSource, Community Colleges of Spokane and other community partnerships, WIA service providers responded to more rapid response events than in previous years, signifying plant closures and large layoffs. Major employers like Kaiser Aluminum and Boeing were impacted as well as closures of smaller employers who had been part of the community for many years.

In conjunction with the Northeast Washington Hospital Association, a Healthcare Taskforce was formed. Building upon earlier SKILLS panel work (with INTEC), a Department of Labor Sectoral Employment Demonstration Grant (developed with Community Colleges of Spokane), an Industries of the Future Skills Training contract and an H1-B application were approved and funded.

### *Youth Services*

Out of the September 2001 Youth Council Retreat came the Youth Systems Development project. A planning committee of WDC, Youth Council, WIA providers and other prominent youth servicing agencies (City-County Chase Youth Commission and Junior Achievement) put together what was to become the Eastern Washington Summit 2002 - Rethinking Workforce Services for Youth.

**BENTON-FRANKLIN  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL**



*Local Partnerships*

WorkSource Columbia Basin, through its 12 partner organizations, continues to offer integrated service delivery to over 13,000 customers each month averaging in excess of 500 customers daily accessing services on site. Huge strides were made in the past year at integrating services and funding streams. Unbeknownst to the job seeker or business customer, staff are performing functions and duties traditionally performed by multiple organizations prior to implementation of a One Stop seamless service delivery design. All staff in our facility enjoy a full complement of training and staff development activities regardless of which organization employs them.

*WorkSource Implementation*

WorkSource Columbia Basin takes continuous quality improvement seriously. In order to offer the services that meet the needs of the job seeker customer, a Customer Focus Group was established. A diverse representation of jobseekers, chosen from across all programs, is invited to WorkSource once a quarter to participate in a facilitated group session. The concept engages our job seeker customers in defining service needs through a survey and discussion around the services they received. Survey questions remain consistent in the area of customer services relating to greeter & facilitator services and, in the area of facility services relating to core, intensive, and program services. The survey concludes with questions on customer satisfaction to assist WorkSource in further identifying areas where additional services, resources, or other improvements can be made. We look forward to utilizing the secret shopper data as a quality improvement tool in the coming year.

*Employer Services*

The Customer Focus Groups have been well attended by job seekers and valuable customer feedback has been received and implemented by WorkSource staff. Plans are underway to establish quarterly Business Customer Focus Groups to engage the business customer in identifying ways to improve services and explore innovations in quality improvement processes.

The WDC has recently implemented the *Work Keys* employability skills assessment tool. *Work Keys* is designed to describe job skill requirements, measure an individual's skills, and match people to jobs. *Work Keys* offers assessments in the areas of applied mathematics, applied technology, listening, locating information, observation, reading for information, teamwork, writing and business writing. The WDC has a staff person trained for administering the assessments to job seekers, and is certified to profile specific jobs for specific occupations/jobs for our business customer.

The WDC, at the request of our local economic development organization called TRIDEC, participated with The Fluor Corporation in commissioning a Tri-Cities Area Workforce Report compiled and produced by The Pathfinders. The report represents the objective and professional view of The Pathfinders with regard to workforce availability, cost, skills, and quality that a new employer can expect in the Tri-Cities region. For the first time we have information on workers who would be willing to change jobs for a salary increase and what level of increase they would need to accept new employment. TRIDEC will utilize this information in their business recruitment activities.

Our Business Services Team made considerable progress in the last year in their approach to the business customer. This is a work in progress and we look forward to further integration in the coming year. The Business Services Unit is staffed by individuals from multiple funding streams and allows us to approach the employer with a full array of services instead of approaching them one at a time from many organizations looking to develop a job for one client group or specific program.

The WDC has been successful in efforts to leverage formula funds with grant funds. In a partnership with the Tri-County WDC and the Eastern Washington Partnership WDC, Benton-Franklin was awarded a U.S. Department of Labor Customized Employment Grant. The

*(Continued next page)*

*(Benton-Franklin Workforce Development Council con't.)*

purpose of the grant is for strategic planning and implementation activities which will improve employment and career advancement of people with disabilities through the One-Stop delivery system.

Additionally, the WDC was awarded a SKILLS grant targeting the health and allied services industry sector, an *Industries of the Future* Skills Training grant in the construction industry and, a Health Care Occupational Training for Youth Grant.

### *Youth Services*

Summer activities for youth are now fully tied to the career pathway they are exploring in school. In this past year we have established a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with all of our school districts that allows us to share the responsibility for delivering the ten required service elements for youth in WIA programs. WIA funded staff are certifying employer work sites according to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) work-based learning standards and maintaining a database for the local schools to utilize for work sites during the school year for all students.

## State Highlights

### Introduction

Included below are descriptions of some major state-level leadership activities carried out in Program Year 2001. These activities support the Governor's goals for the workforce development system as described in Washington State's Unified Plan for Workforce Development. Services and activities described below were supported, in part, by WIA Title I-B Statewide Activities Funds.

- ◆ Worker Profiling
- ◆ Claimant Placement Program
- ◆ Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Programs
- ◆ Worker Retraining Program
- ◆ WorkFirst (employment services only)
- ◆ English as a Second Language Programs

In response to local needs and interests, the local Workforce Development Councils have added partners to their areas' WorkSource service network.

In Program Year 2001, the WorkSource Operations Division of the Employment Security Department focused on three strategic areas to improve WorkSource labor exchange and related services.

- ◆ *Reemployment services* for unemployment insurance claimants.
- ◆ *Job seeker services* for all people seeking employment assistance.
- ◆ *Services to businesses* for companies seeking assistance.

*Reemployment services* were a primary focus for WorkSource because of the overwhelming number of job seekers unemployed as a result of last year's economic downturn. The immediate need was to expand services to unemployment insurance claimants. Moreover, it was important to implement strategies for people close to exhausting their regular and extended unemployment insurance benefits.

A team of representatives from three divisions of the Employment Security Department guided this work. One of the tasks was to redesign the Profiling Statistical Identification model. This was completed in early July 2002. Another was to introduce and integrate the Job Search Review Program (JSRP.) A third task was to provide reemployment skills training through a Job Hunter Workshop Series. This training was provided to nearly 126,600 claimants in Program Year 2001. As part of the



The One-Stop Career Development System in Washington State is called *WorkSource*. Twenty-five full-service WorkSource Career Development Centers across the state provide employers and job seekers access to workforce services, career planning information either in person or electronically. There are also 39 *affiliate* locations offering more specialized services. WorkSource is the interface connecting employers and jobseekers with workforce development partners at the community level. The first part of Section II of this report offers some excellent examples of local WorkSource services. WorkSource allows both employers and jobseekers easier access to workforce services and information. At WorkSource Centers, job seekers have free use of computers, copiers, faxes, and other tools for career planning and job search. They also have access to self-service and staff assisted job search and to workshops on how to get and keep a job. WorkSource is also designed to help businesses take advantage of computer job matching services, get assistance with recruitment and layoffs, and access electronic resume banks, labor market information, and retraining resources.

Program information and access to services coordinated through WorkSource partners includes the 14 required federal employment and training programs and the following state funded programs:

Job Hunter Workshop Series program, a *capacity model* was developed to better enable WorkSource sites to determine their physical, as well as resource capacity, to provide this training.

*Job seeker services* were refined to improve access to WorkSource universal core services in a variety of ways. The WorkSource website: [www.go2worksource.com](http://www.go2worksource.com) was upgraded to make it easier to use. In March 2002, a link with the new WorkSource management information technology system, SKIES, provided WorkSource staff on-line access to job and staff-assisted listings. In the 4th quarter of PY01, this increased the number of job listings available on-line from 8,300 to 37,000 (nearly 450 percent). SKIES also allowed WorkSource partners access to job listings and other employment and training information for their customers.

*Services to business* through WorkSource were emphasized in Program Year 2001. The concept of a single point of contact was promoted throughout WorkSource. In a "single point of contact system," all partners providing services to a particular business are encouraged to coordinate those services as a team. One team member serves as the main contact and communication point, while other team members are kept informed, pooling information and resources. Businesses benefit by this "case-managed" approach because it is far less complicated than having to deal with multiple contacts.

### Improving WorkSource Services and Outcomes For People With Disabilities

The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board's (WTECB) Strategic Plan for Workforce Development includes strategies to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities (see page 22).

In Program Year 2001, the state's WorkSource Operations Team, made up of state and local partner agencies, began discussions on how to improve services and outcomes for people with disabilities.

A joint steering committee made up of six state agen-

cies and the Washington Workforce Association continues to implement this work, ensuring that the multifaceted approaches are not duplicative and lead to program improvements. Here is a summary of these recent efforts and agency commitments:

The Employment Security Department dedicated a total of \$750,000 in WIA statewide discretionary funds to the Governor's Committee on Disability Issues and Employment (GCDE) for a Technical Assistance Center. The funds will also support a website, an 800 call-in number for assistance, assistive technology (AT) funding, a lending library of AT equipment, an accommodation fund pool, and mentoring, consultation, and training support to the field.

The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) agreed to have its staff provide assessments of programmatic and physical access to WorkSource Centers and offer technical assistance to address identified needs.

A U.S. Department of Labor Workforce Incentive Grant (WIG) was awarded to the Washington Workforce Association (WWA). WWA is a statewide association that promotes, enhances, and serves the interests of Washington State Workforce Development Councils. The purpose of the new federal grant is to increase disability access throughout the system. The grant includes assessment, technical assistance, assistance implementing AT, funding for pilot projects, a best practice conference, staff training conference, outreach planning, employer services, and statewide evaluation.

The Washington State Developmental Disabilities Council's five-year state plan identifies funding for innovative projects that will result in individuals with developmental disabilities getting jobs through WorkSource.

Finally, the Washington State Legislature, through Senate Memorial 8014, has directed the state disability agencies/councils to report annually to the Legislature on the status of training and employment of people with disabilities.

### *SKIES Implementation*

The Employment Security Department developed the SKIES (Services, Knowledge, and Information Exchange System), an internet-based management technology system, which was implemented on April 8, 2002. This system supports employment and training case management and job matching functionality. The statewide implementation was the culmination of a project that spanned four years of planning, analysis, software development and business preparation.

SKIES provides a single statewide information repository supporting the employment and training business operations of twelve Workforce Development Councils and Labor Exchange activities of all WorkSource (One-Stop) partners. It also supports the reporting requirements of both the Wagner-Peyser Act and the Workforce Investment Act. Since all partners in the WorkSource Centers and Affiliates use SKIES for case management and labor exchange, customer information is accessible by all partners. The customer only needs to provide his or her information once to have access and information related to all programs provided through the Centers or Affiliates. SKIES also can produce cross-program reports. These reports are rolled up into a single report allowing a comprehensive view of the entire delivery system.

SKIES is a complex system that incorporates: 78 Screens; 48 Reports; 228 Relational Tables; 2,145 Logons; 1,375 Users Logged In; 743,803 Job Seekers; 250,000 Employers; 76 Gigabytes in the Database; 18 Interfaces and 60 Batch Procedures. As the system is refined and further developed, it is anticipated that additional functionality as well as additional users will be added.

### *Statewide Rapid Response*

The Employment Security Department Dislocated Worker Unit (DWU) is responsible for providing statewide rapid response activities in collaboration with the twelve local Workforce Development Councils. Upon

receiving a Worker Adjustment Retraining Notification (WARNs), including mass layoffs and plant closures, or other dislocation events, immediate contact is made with the employer, representatives of the affected workers, and the local community. Early intervention allows employers and workers to communicate about worker concerns, to take advantage of worker transition committee opportunities, to initiate peer worker projects and to identify, design, and oversee layoff aversion and incumbent worker strategies.

Customization of services for the specific population being laid off enhances the success of rapid response by helping workers transition quickly to reemployment. Rapid response is also linked with Trade Act programs to deliver timely benefits and services to trade-affected workers. When the employer permits and space is available, rapid response events are provided on-site rather than off-site, or as close to the workplace as possible. On-site assistance promotes the convenience and ease of access for the workers. Rapid response resources provide the foundation for leveraging resources for a specific layoff and offer workers with the services they need to return to employment quickly.

Three notable rapid response best practices in Washington include: (1) partnering with the Washington State Labor Council ensuring technical assistance from labor in support of statewide delivery of rapid response activities; (2) contracting with peer workers to ensure that workers are aware and take full advantage of the wide range of reemployment services available; and (3) producing a monthly publication of the *The Red Flag and Early Warning Report* which provides information to key state agencies about worker dislocations.

It should be noted that rapid response to the events of September 11, 2001, included Washington State receiving a National Emergency Grant (NEG) from the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). The state was awarded up to \$15 million, of which \$5 million was immediately released to serve workers dislocated from the airline, aerospace, and related industries subsequent to the

events of September 11. Through the direction of a state-wide advisory committee, chaired by the Employment Security Department's Commissioner, Dr. Sylvia Mundy, six local WDCs provide job search assistance, job counseling, training, out-of-area job search, relocation assistance, and supportive services to these laid-off workers.

### *Update to the State's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*

The Washington State Unified Plan was approved by the U.S. Department of Labor and its federal partner agencies in June 2000. The Unified Plan includes the State Strategic Plan for Workforce Development and the following operating plans: the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title I-B and Wagner-Peyser State Plan, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act State Plan, and the State Plan for Adult and Family Literacy.

State statutes require the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to update the state Strategic Plan for the Workforce Development every two years. In the second half of 2001, the Board began amending and adding strategies in response to changes in the economic climate. For example, the plan supports the development of industry skills panels in high demand economic clusters such as health care and these comprise employers, labor and education stakeholders in local areas. The Board requested that the 2002 plan place increased emphasis on improving education and workforce outcomes for youth and people from target populations (people with disabilities, people of color, and women.)

Five work groups comprising stakeholders from industry and education provided input and feedback on the plan. Work Groups for skills gap, wage progression, and dislocated worker issues provided input via email. A target populations work group provided input on strategies that are incorporated into Goal 3 to remove unique barriers to employment and increase wage progression, and Goal 4 to integrate workforce development programs

to improve customer service. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Association of Washington Business co-managed the work group for youth issues that appear throughout the plan. The Board also received recommendations of a Health Care Labor Shortage Work Group. The Board's Interagency Committee, made up of state agencies that are responsible for carrying out the plan, also gave input at various stages of the plans formation

In March 2002, the Board approved dissemination of a draft plan for public comment. Board staff distributed the draft to thousands of individuals and organizations through e-mail and conducted public forums in Spokane and Seattle. The Board asked readers of the updated plan to complete a survey instrument ranking the importance of strategies listed in the plan.

On May 28, 2002, the Board, on behalf of the Governor, adopted the updated plan entitled: *High Skills High Wages – Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development: Our Agenda for Action*. For a copy of this plan please go to: <http://www.wtb.wa.gov>.

In coordination with the U.S. Department of Labor, the Board also modified the state Strategic Plan for Workforce Development to incorporate revised WIA Title I-B program performance levels for Program Year 2001. This was done in accordance to WIA Sec.136 (b)(3)(A) and in consideration for the unanticipated changes in the state's economy, characteristics of program participants, and program services.

### *Eligible Training Provider (ETP) List*

More than 1,900 training programs are on Washington State's Eligible Training Provider (ETP) list, approximately 25 percent in private career schools and 75 percent in public institutions, schools, and colleges. The training programs identified on this statewide list qualify to receive WIA Title I-B Individual Training Accounts (training vouchers). All 34 public community and technical colleges and the majority of public universities are participating in the ETP process.

Washington state's years of work in developing com-



mon performance indicators across the state and federal workforce programs have made it possible to reach agreement on ETP performance criteria and on the review process to meet performance requirements. To be included on the state ETP list, a training program must meet performance floors and targets for completion rate, employment rate, and earnings level. Procedures used to determine these rates are calculated in the same manner for all training programs. This assures consistency and equitability. On March 28, 2002, the state Workforce Board, on behalf of the Governor, adopted third year Eligible Training Provider performance levels and procedures that were used to identify occupational skills training programs qualifying for WIA Title I-B training vouchers in Program Year 2002.

Washington State's Eligible Training Provider (ETP) list is on-line at: <http://www.wtb.wa.gov/etp> and is linked to the national site at: <http://www.careeronestop.org>. The web site is designed to help customers and staff search the list by geographic regions, by training provider, and by training program. Also, training providers can apply, using the web site, to have training programs placed on the list. The ETP web site links to <http://www.jobtrainingresults.org>. This customer oriented site provides training program performance and school information including student characteristics, employment, and earnings of past students.

### *Targeting Workforce Development Resources for Economic Vitality*

In order to target state resources strategically for workforce development in 2002, the Employment Security Department (ESD), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTECB) coordinated the allocation of certain funds for workforce development. Priority for these funds was given to key occupations and industries. By targeting key sectors of the economy, workforce development promotes economic vitality and helps ensure that students and workers find good jobs at the end of their training. The agen-

cies coordinated four Requests for Proposals (RFPs). The four RFPs were: the state Workforce Board's Securing Key Industry Leadership for Learning Skills (SKILLS); SBCTC's Skills Standards RFP and a RFP for High Demand Programs; and ESD's Industries of the Future Skills Training Fund (IFST) RFP. A total of \$4.3 million dollars was invested in this initiative, with ESD funding the IFST projects.

The four RFPs reflected four stages of workforce development. The first stage is to bring together the leaders in a key economic sector for the purpose of identifying critical skill needs and identifying solutions. The second stage is to use the partnership to develop industry skill standards. The third stage is to develop new training programs that prepare workers to meet the standards. And the fourth stage is to actually provide the training.

The Employment Security Department awarded two rounds of funding for Industries of the Future Skills Training Fund (IFST) totaling \$1.8 million in WIA Title I-B Statewide Activities Funds. In addition, the local projects had matching amounts from the employer community ranging from a minimum of 50 percent to as much as 150 percent. A total of 14 projects were awarded in each of the 12 workforce development areas for incumbent worker training in the technology, health-care, manufacturing, retail and construction industries.

As described above, the state Workforce Board awarded grants to industry led partnerships to form SKILLS panels. The grants enabled businesses in key industries to organize in order to better identify their skills needs and design approaches to close the identified gaps. In Program Year 2001, eight SKILLS panels were formed supporting strategic workforce development planning in the health care, information technology, and manufacturing industries.

### *Workforce Development Council Re-Certification*

In Winter 2000, Governor Locke certified Washington State's twelve Workforce Development

Councils. The Workforce Investment Act requires governors to certify local area Councils every two years. During the fall of 2001, the state Workforce Board considered and adopted recommendations to the Governor on criteria for re-certification. Governor Locke established his re-certification criteria on January 28, 2002. Applications for Council re-certification were submitted by Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEOs). The applications identified the community leaders the CLEOs chose to appoint to serve on the Council for the period beginning July 1, 2002. The majority of Council appointees are from business. In May and June 2002, a state Workforce Board committee reviewed the twelve applications and recommended certification approval to the Governor. Governor Locke renewed certifications for all twelve Councils.

### *Fall 2001 Workforce Conference*

Washington State held its first statewide workforce leadership conference in Walla Walla on October 11-12, 2001. The *Connecting the Dots for Economic Vitality: Workforce Strategies 2001* conference was a huge success. Due to space limitations, registration was closed at 285. Conference workshops addressed issues including emerging economic development strategies, national and state workforce policies, labor/management partnerships, apprenticeship, and changes taking place to help high school students with career preparation. Portions of the conference were taped by TVW, the state's public affairs television network and are archived at <http://www.tvw.org>.

At the conference, three partnerships were honored with a Governor's Best Practices Award: Pierce County Careers Consortium; WorkSource Walla Walla's Proficiency Testing Center; and Grays Harbor Employers' Assistance Project.

Two programs, WorkSource Walla Walla's Secret Shopper Program and the Pierce County Health Services Council received Promising Practices Award and the Seattle-King County Out-of-School Youth Consortium received a Good Idea Award.

### *Dislocated Worker Symposium 2001*

Approximately 150 individuals from throughout the state attended the first annual Dislocated Worker Symposium June 20, 2001. The symposium focused on the new economy and possible implications on workforce development for dislocated workers.

Attendees included representatives from the WorkSource system including case managers, worker retraining coordinators from community and technical colleges, supervisors and policy makers from local Workforce Development Areas.

### *Statewide Activities Summary*

The Employment Security Department has management and oversight responsibility for WIA Title I-B Statewide Activities Funds. Among other purposes, these funds support the Governor's continuing interest in:

- ◆ Addressing critical health care shortages
- ◆ Developing strategies to keep kids in school and engage them in learning opportunities that will enable them to enter careers or continue education
- ◆ Improving access to services for persons with disabilities
- ◆ Linking workforce development to economic development

Washington State invested in all of the required statewide employment and training activities and several other optional activities in support of the Governor's goals for the workforce development system as described in Washington State's Unified Plan for Workforce Development. The activities were consistent with WIA Title I-B Sec.134(a)(2)(B) and Sec.134(a)(3). Statewide activities included:

- ◆ *Supporting and disseminating a state Eligible Training Provider (ETP) list* (see page 22)
- ◆ *Conducting research and evaluations* (see pages 29 through 34 in Section III of this report)

◆ *Providing incentive grants to local areas for exemplary performance*

The Employment Security Department allocated funds to local Workforce Development Councils based on state Workforce Board policy to reward local areas that exceeded 100 percent of the average of the expected levels of performance for the state and federal core indicators. There were four award funds, one for each of the three service populations (youth, adult, and dislocated workers) and one for customer satisfaction.

◆ *Providing technical assistance local areas failing to meet local performance measures*

The Employment Security Department established procedures used by local Workforce Development Councils to access funds for technical assistance. The WDCs used these technical assistance resources to improve the quality of customer services that influence program performance outcomes.

◆ *Assisting in the establishment and operation of the one-stop delivery system*

A portion of the WIA Title I-B statewide activities funds were distributed equally among the 12 Workforce Development Councils for enhancement and expansion of WorkSource services. Most WDCs utilized the funds to improve infrastructure needs, partnership building, case management, and data tracking systems, and facilities improvements to accommodate more customers and partners, e.g. resource room and telecommunications equipment (see descriptions of WorkSource services on page 19).

◆ *Operating a statewide information technology system* (see description of SKIES development on pages 20 and 21)

◆ *Providing additional assistance to local areas that have high concentrations of eligible youth*

Funds were used to assist local Youth Council staff in assessing the capacity of the workforce development system to address barriers faced by youth.

◆ *Providing capacity building and technical assistance*

The state offered training to service delivery staff on understanding federal and state WIA performance measures. A nationally known presenter provided training sessions on strategies for improving WIA Title I-B performance. Training sessions on one-stop comprehensive financial management were also offered throughout the state.

◆ *Conducting demonstrations*

(See description of industry-led SKILLS panels on page 23)

◆ *Implementing innovative incumbent worker training programs*

(See description of Industries of the Future Training Fund (ISFT) on page 23)

◆ *Implementing innovative programs to increase the number of individuals training for and placed in nontraditional employment*

A pilot project was implemented in Program Year 2001 to provide non-traditional pre-apprenticeship training to low income individuals and minority populations. Based on the model and the contractor's expertise, a desk guide will be developed and training offered to staff in local WorkSource Centers to assist them with career counseling for apprenticeship programs.

## WIA TITLE I-B RESULTS

This section supplies the required portions of Washington State's Title I-B Annual Report. The section includes:

- ◆ Analysis of adjustments made to WIA performance measures in response to changes in economic conditions and participant characteristics.
- ◆ A narrative section discussing the costs of workforce development activities relative to the effect of activities on the performance of participants.
- ◆ A description of State evaluations of workforce development activities, including a net-impact study of services provided under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).
- ◆ Comments on the common core indicators of performance proposed by the federal office of Management and Budget.
- ◆ A table section that includes negotiated performance levels and actual performance on 17 federal and 9 state measures of program performance.

### Analysis

WIA I-B performance measures focus on the results for the six percent of WorkSource customers who are registered for intensive services or training services funded by Title I-B. Separate funding is provided for disadvantaged adults, dislocated workers, and disadvantaged youth. Each population has its own set of measures, covering employment rates, retention in employment, earnings, and credential attainment. Participant satisfaction and employer satisfaction are measured by telephone survey.

Federal and state performance measures have precise definitions. Employment earnings measures are based on wage records collected by state Unemployment Insurance (UI) systems for use in assessing employer payroll taxes and determining UI benefit eligibility. Washington's federal and state measures use UI wage records from Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Idaho, and Montana. Federal and military payroll records are also collected. Washington participates in the Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS), which provides UI wage records from 23 other states. Wage records available from this system cover 56 percent of civilian noninstitutional employment in the United States.

Some measures require information on enrollment in further education or training following program exit. This information is gathered by data matching using in-

formation supplied by the state's two and four-year colleges, by private career schools, apprenticeship programs and by organizations seeking eligibility to become WIA eligible providers. Some of the credential information needed for credential attainment measures is also obtained from these sources.

Definitions of the 17 federal and 9 state WIA core measures of performance can be found at <http://www.wtb.wa.gov/wiaperfmeasures.pps>. Washington's core measures of performance are used to report the results for most workforce development programs, including secondary and postsecondary vocational education, adult basic education, private career schools, and apprenticeship. (Washington State has 12 state core measures, but three state customer satisfaction measures were not collected last year. They will be measured and included in next year's report).

Washington's performance targets (called "negotiated performance levels" by WIA) are among the highest in the country, thanks to the high performance of Washington's JTPA program. Performance targets in WIA's first three years were based on performance baselines derived from JTPA performance in 1997-98. Economic conditions have changes substantially in Washington since that time period. Downturns in aerospace, high tech employment, and construction increased unemployment in Washington State, and led to major

changes in the types of workers seeking services. Washington State had the highest average annual unemployment rate among the 50 states during 2001; it has the second highest rate for the first four months of 2002. Moreover, Washington faced the greatest increase in unemployment rates between 1998 and 2002 of any state in the Western Region.

The Workforce Investment Act provides a means to revise negotiated targets in the face of such circumstances. Washington State requested and received adjustments to its negotiated performance targets for PY01, based on regression analyses showing the relationship between economic and demographic conditions and performance. Separate regression models were estimated for 13 of the 17 federal performance measures. Washington State proposed downward revisions for 12 of these 13 measures, and the Department of Labor accepted. Details of the request and regression models may be found at: <http://www.wtb.wa.gov/WIA-Revisions.htm>. The negotiated performance levels displayed in this report are the revised targets resulting from these adjustments. The negotiated performance levels shown in the Tables "O" showing local targets are regression adjusted using the same models, but based on local unemployment and earnings data not available in mid-2002.

Washington's high levels of performance under WIA continued in PY 2001. Washington performed at an average of 104% of the 17 federal measures, 132% of nine state measures, and 114% of the 26 measures overall (after target adjustments). Washington exceeded its av-

erage federal targets despite the fact that its negotiated performance levels were set at 105% of the average targets for other states, even after regression adjustments.

### Cost Effectiveness

Normally, discussion of the impacts of workforce development activities would be based on a net-impact analysis designed to measure the costs and long-range results of services. Results for participants would be compared with estimates of the likely results for participants in the absence of the programs. Washington State's recent net-impact studies, (reported below) use information from JTPA exiters from the 1997-98 and 1999-00 periods, the period just prior to WIA implementation. Estimates based on WIA participants themselves may not be available for at least a year. Until such studies can be completed, we will need to rely on rough estimates of possible results based on cost and service figures from the first two years of WIA.

Washington's 12 Workforce Development areas spent \$51 million on intensive and training services during program year 2001 (July 2000-June 2001), serving 18,726 participants, at an average cost of \$2,724 as shown below:

Many of these participants have not yet finished participation in WIA services. However, it is possible to show the potential magnitude of WIA benefits by examining results for participants exiting WIA during the first full program year 2000 (July 1999-June 2000).

Services to adults and dislocated workers are geared primarily to assisting participants in finding employment

TARGET POPULATION	PY 2001 PARTICIPANTS	PY 2001 EXPENDITURES	COST PER PARTICIPANT
Adults	5,253	\$ 16,125,473	\$ 3,070
Dislocated Workers	7,827	\$ 17,024,650	\$ 2,175
Youth	1,027	\$ 17,862,119	\$ 3,164
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,726</b>	<b>\$ 51,012,242</b>	<b>\$ 2,724</b>

TARGET POPULATION	PY 2000 WIA EXITERS	PERCENT EMPLOYED	AVERAGE EARNINGS	PROJECTED FIRST YEAR EARNINGS OF PY 2001 WIA PARTICIPANTS
Adults	1,265	83%	\$ 11,290	\$ 59,308,753
Dislocated Workers	2,253	86%	\$ 21,018	\$ 164,509,913
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,518</b>	<b>85%</b>		<b>\$ 223,818,666</b>

or improving their employment and earnings. Often the participant's skills and marketability are improved through the use of classroom or on-the-job skills training. During program year 2000, some 3,518 participants in the adult and dislocated worker populations completed participation in WIA programs. Eighty-five percent of the participants found employment during the four quarters following their exit.

Assuming this year's WIA adults and dislocated worker participants earn the same average amount in the year following their program exits, the \$ 33.2 million spent on this population could be followed by up to \$224 million in participant earnings. This assumption may be too optimistic due to recent economic declines. Historically, though, participants in these populations have earned roughly seven times the amount spent per year on program services during the first year following program completion.

The benefits of services to youth populations are more complicated to analyze. A major goal for youth is to make sure that young people complete high school and invest appropriately in skills training. Programs that maximize employment opportunities and earnings for young people may have the unintended consequences of detracting from educational and long run economic success unless they are carefully designed.

Sixty-five percent of the 1,694 youth participants in WIA programs who exited during PY 2000 remained in school, returned to school, or enrolled in postsecondary vocational education during the following year. Sixty-five percent of all youth worked during the year following exit, including 62 percent of the continuing students and

72 percent of those who did not continue their educations. Some 90% of WIA youth either worked or continued their schooling during the year following exit.

JTPA youth earned an average of \$3,364 during the year following exit. The wages available to PY 2000 youth participants during the first year after exit (\$19.0 million) exceed the annual program costs (\$17.9 million). It is worth remembering that youth work hours are reduced by their participation in further education and that participation in further vocational education should produce long-run benefits.

Last year's cost effectiveness analysis was based on the results for JTPA exiters from program year 1999. Exiters from the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs worked at rates similar to JTPA exiters and received higher average earnings. The story is different for the youth cohort. WIA youth were less likely to work during the year following exit and more likely to remain in or return to school than their JTPA counterparts.

### *Evaluation Activities*

The state legislation that established Washington's Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board called for the implementation of a comprehensive research program. This program continues under WIA, and will be used to measure the results of federal and state workforce investment activities. The research effort contains four elements:

- ◆ *High Skills High Wages: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*, which incorporates research results from a variety of sources.
- ◆ *Workforce Training Results: An Evaluation of*

*Washington State's Workforce Development System*, a biennial study of the outcomes of workforce development programs.

- ◆ *Workforce Training Supply, Demand and Gaps*, a biennial analysis of the supply of and demand for skilled workers in Washington.
- ◆ A net impact study, conducted every four years, with results folded into *Workforce Training Results* reports.

Publications resulting from the most recent round of research can be found at <http://www.wtb.wa.gov/pubs99.html>.

*Workforce Training Results* studies participants who exited workforce development programs between July 1999 and June 2000.

*Workforce Training Results* groups programs into three groups. Programs for adults include Community and Technical College Job Preparatory Training, Private Career Schools, Apprenticeship, a state funded Worker Retraining program at Community and Technical Colleges, and JTPA Title III (Dislocated Workers). Programs serving adults with barriers to employment include Adult Basic Skills Education, JTPA Title II-A (Adults), and Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Programs serving youth include Secondary Career and Technical Education and JTPA Title II-C (Youth). The report describes the demographics of each population, services received, competencies gained, participant satisfaction, and the satisfaction of employers who have hired participants. Employment results are measured using both surveys and Employment Security Department earnings records.

The associated net impact study measures long-range outcomes for program participants who exited between July 1997 and June 1998 and measures short-range outcomes for participants who exited between July 1999 and June 2000. This work produces a "final" re-

port on Washington's JTPA results. This work will provide a good baseline for long-term measurement of WIA. The first biennial reports to cover WIA participants are due in 2004, and will cover participants exiting between July 2001 and June 2002.

Employment, earnings, and net impact results from *Workforce Training Results* are excerpted below. Readers are invited to consult the full executive summary and full report on our website when publication preparations are completed in early 2003.

### *Employment Results*

We evaluate the labor market outcomes of program participants by examining their employment and earnings during the third quarter after leaving a program. When considering these outcomes, please note that those who left programs during the later part of the 1999-2000 program year encountered a weakening labor market during their third quarter after exit. The full brunt of the recession had not yet hit, but unemployment rates were already on the rise.

We used Employment Security Department records to examine changes in employment rates between participants who left programs during the 1997-98 and 1999-2000 program years.<sup>1</sup> Employment rates increased substantially among participants in community and technical college job training and, especially, apprenticeships. Employment rates for JTPA adults and youth declined; perhaps the weakening labor market had a more adverse impact on these groups (Figure 1). The employment rate also declined for secondary career and technical education. However, the total placement rate for this program, which takes into account both employment and enrollment in further education, remained stable at 75 percent.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Employment rates based on matches are lower than those based on survey results. Employment Security records do not contain information on self-employment. The estimates also exclude employment in states that are not included in our matching process.

<sup>2</sup> Among the students leaving secondary career and technical education in 1997-98, the total placement rate was 74 percent.


### Earnings Results

Research has shown that post-program earnings are very much affected by the characteristics of the participants who entered the program. Youth had the lowest post-program hourly wages and quarterly earnings, and adults had the highest (Figure 2). Earnings and hourly wages were particularly high for individuals who par-

ticipated in apprenticeship. In addition to the quality of the program, this finding reflects the length of the training and the labor market in their occupations and industries.

In all programs, hourly wages were higher, even after controlling for inflation, than were found two years ago. The largest wage increases were among participants

**FIGURE 1 – PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS WITH EMPLOYMENT REPORTED TO EMPLOYMENT SECURITY 6 TO 9 MONTHS AFTER LEAVING THEIR PROGRAM**



**FIGURE 2 – MEDIAN HOURLY WAGES AND ANNUALIZED EARNINGS 6 TO 9 MONTHS AFTER LEAVING THE PROGRAM**

	HOURLY WAGES OF 1999-2000 PARTICIPANTS	ANNUALIZED EARNINGS OF 1999-2000 PARTICIPANTS	PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1997-1998*	
			HOURLY WAGES	EARNINGS
<b>PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS</b>				
Community & Technical College (CTC) Job Preparatory Training	\$13.17	\$24,227	16%	20%
Private Career Schools	\$11.24	\$19,353	20%	18%
Apprenticeship	\$19.24	\$32,420	10%	15%
JTPA Dislocated Workers	\$12.88	\$24,075	1%	1%
CTC Worker Retraining	\$12.86	\$23,531	10%	8%
<b>PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS WITH BARRIERS</b>				
Adult Basic Skills	\$9.25	\$15,317	4%	-3%
JTPA Adult	\$9.72	\$15,523	5%	1%
DVR Vocational Rehabilitation	\$9.17	\$13,013	6%	4%
<b>PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH</b>				
Secondary Career & Technical Ed	\$8.28	\$10,258	6%	3%
JTPA Youth	\$7.65	\$7,364	12%	9%

\* All figures are reported in 2001 quarter 1 dollars; i.e., controlling for inflation.



in programs serving adults. Wage growth was more modest for the programs serving those with barriers to employment and for secondary career and technical education. Still, real wages among the participants in these programs were 4 to 6 percent higher than reported two years ago.

### Net Impact and Cost-Benefit Evaluation

In addition to providing the outcomes of the programs, the report also includes the findings of net impact and cost-benefit evaluations. These evaluations attempt to estimate what happens to program participants as compared to what would have happened if they had not participated in a workforce development program. The objective is to determine the difference that the program made for the participant. The Workforce Board contracted with the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employ-

ment Research<sup>3</sup> to conduct the net impact and cost-benefit evaluations. Upjohn performed these evaluations for nine of the ten programs.<sup>4</sup>

Individuals who participated in these workforce development programs were compared to similar individuals who didn't. The comparison groups were selected from registrants with the state's Employment Service.<sup>5</sup> An empirical approach, called statistical matching, was used to find the Employment Service registrant who most closely matched each program participant in terms of a long list of characteristics.<sup>6</sup> (Please see the technical appendix to the full report for a more detailed methodological discussion.)

For the cost-benefit analyses, Upjohn calculated the value of the net impacts on participant earnings, employee benefits, social welfare benefits, unemployment insurance benefits, and taxes.<sup>7</sup> Benefits and costs were

**FIGURE 3 – LONGER-TERM EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS NET IMPACTS**

	EMPLOYMENT	QUARTERLY EARNINGS (AMONG THOSE WORKING)	LIFETIME EARNINGS**
Community & Technical College (CTC) Job Preparatory Training	7.0%	\$1,185	\$96,263
Apprenticeship	5.3%	\$1,908	\$162,443
JTPA III Dislocated Workers	7.3%	\$466	\$75,293
CTC Worker Retraining	6.3%	\$423	\$66,268
JTPA II-A Adults	7.4%	\$543	\$61,565
Adult Basic Skills	1.6%	*	\$5,263 <sup>v</sup>
Secondary Career & Technical Ed	5.7%	\$451	\$59,363
JTPA II-C Youth	5.3%	*	\$28,853 <sup>10</sup>

Longer-term refers to impacts observed 8 to 11 quarters after leaving the program.

\* Not statistically significant at the 0.10 level.

\*\* This is the increase in earnings (above that of the comparison group) projected to age 65 and discounted at 3 percent. Includes effects from increased employment and increased earnings among those employed.

Longer-term impacts were not estimated for private career school programs because of data constraints.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Kevin Hollenbeck headed the team.

<sup>4</sup> Net impacts were not estimated for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Program, because no viable comparison group was available for DVR clients.

<sup>5</sup> A different source of data was used for the comparison group for secondary career and technical education. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction collects data on high school seniors. This Graduate Follow-Up Study was used to identify both students completing vocation-technical education as well as comparable students who had not completed vocational education.

<sup>6</sup> These include demographics (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, prior education, age, region of the state), preprogram earnings and employment history, UI benefit receipt history, and preprogram receipt of public assistance.

<sup>7</sup> Upjohn estimated the impact of the net change in earnings on social security, Medicare, federal income, and state sales taxes.

**FIGURE 4 – PARTICIPANT BENEFITS, PUBLIC COSTS AND INCREASES IN TAX RECEIPTS TO AGE 65**

	PARTICIPANT BENEFITS*	PUBLIC COSTS**	INCREASED TAX RECEIPTS***
Community & Technical College (CTC) Job Preparatory Training	\$114,141	\$6,916	\$24,210
JTPA III Dislocated Workers	\$78,177	\$2,575	\$18,936
CTC Worker Retraining	\$65,025	\$4,692	\$16,666
JTPA II-A Adults	\$73,518	\$3,384	\$15,484
Adult Basic Skills	\$6,038	\$983	\$1,324
Secondary Career & Technical Ed	\$71,236	\$870	\$14,930
JTPA II-C Youth	\$34,281	\$2,325	\$7,257

\* Present value of the additional lifetime earnings and employee benefits less foregone earnings during program participation.

\*\* State and federal program costs per participant.

\*\*\* Present value of additional social security, Medicare, federal income and state sales taxes generated by increased participant earnings to age 65.

Cost-benefit comparisons were not made for apprenticeship and private career school programs due to data constraints.

estimated for both the observed post-program period and out to the age of 65.<sup>8</sup>

Upjohn found that during the third year after program participation, the payoffs to education and training are strong and pervasive (Figure 3). The employment impacts for all programs are positive. Seven of the nine programs increased the average earnings of participants. JTPA Title II-C for disadvantaged youth and adult basic education, however, have earning impacts that are essentially zero. While no effect was found for these two programs on the *average* earnings among those working, *total* earnings among participants of these two programs increased because more were working. All other programs show sizeable earnings impacts among those working that, in percentage terms, are on the order of 20 percent. The combined effects on average earnings and employment rates are associated with sizable impacts on total lifetime earnings.

Figure 4 compares lifetime participant benefits to public costs. For example, during the course of work-

ing life to age 65, the average community and technical college job preparatory student will gain about \$95,000 in net earnings (earnings minus foregone earnings while in training) and over \$19,000 in employee benefits. These are net gains compared to the earnings of similar individuals who did not receive training (discounted at 3 percent and expressed in 2001 dollars). The ratio of participant benefits to program costs, not considering impacts on social welfare benefits or taxes, is \$114,141 to \$6,916, or over 16 to 1. Lifetime participant benefits far exceed public costs for each of the programs presented in Figure 4. Cost-benefit comparisons were not calculated for apprenticeship and private career school programs because of data constraints. However, the participant benefits from these programs, discussed in the full report, were achieved with little taxpayer expense.

Tax revenues are also affected by the change in participant earnings (Figure 4). For example, during the entire post-training period to age 65, the public gains an estimated \$18,936 in tax revenues for each JTPA Title

<sup>8</sup> In order to compare benefits and costs in terms of net present values, post-program benefits and costs are discounted by 3 percent per year and all figures are stated in 2001 dollars.

<sup>9</sup> Increases in employment more than offset the small negative earnings impacts among the employed.

<sup>10</sup> Increases in employment more than offset the small negative earnings impacts among the employed.

III participant. Estimated increases in tax receipts alone outweigh public costs for each program. Moreover, several of the programs were found to reduce reliance on social welfare (TANF, food stamps, and medical benefits). The JTPA programs for disadvantaged adults and youth, in particular, were estimated to substantially reduce social welfare receipts during participant lifetimes.

The positive returns on investment seen for workforce training programs, including JTPA programs, suggest that WIA's investments in workforce training and development may be productive ones.

### *Comments on Proposed Federal Core Indicators*

As illustrated above, Washington has considerable interest in and experience with the calculation of common core indicators of performance across different workforce development programs. It is quite useful to use the same metrics to measure performance even when the programs described vary greatly in the types of service provided and in the demographics of those served. Washington has advocated the use of common core measures. The nine state measures shown in the data tables in this report are Washington's common core indicators of performance.

The Federal Office of Management and Budget has proposed a set of common measures for job training. These measures cover entered employment, retention, earnings increase, and efficiency for adult programs and placement in employment and education, attainment of a degree or certificate, literacy and numeracy gains, and efficiency for youth. Details on how these common measures will be calculated are not completely clear, although some of them appear similar to current WIA measures.

The Administration's proposal contains positive features:

- ◆ A smaller and, therefore, more manageable, number of measures.
- ◆ The elimination of credential and goal attainment measures that seem impossible to standardize across the nation.

- ◆ A reliance on administrative records to measure employment, a feature that will help with standardization (although an exception probably should be made for participants whose goal is self-employment, in order to avoid creating a disincentive for programs to offer assistance to would-be entrepreneurs).
- ◆ The elimination of separate measures for younger and older youth that created problems associated with very small numbers of participants.
- ◆ Elimination of nontraditional measures that are process rather than outcome measures.

The proposed measures, however, do have severe weaknesses.

***The measures are too complex:*** For example, the individuals counted in the measures vary from one measure to another. It is unclear why the Administration did not propose simple measures such as: the percentage of former participants that are employed during (x) period after exit, and the median earnings of former participants that are employed during the (x) period after exit. Such measures would be much easier to explain to policy makers and others. Beside ease of explanation, measures that include the full population of former participants would eliminate the incentive for much of the gaming that now goes on in trying to determine how to maximize measured performance results. Too much effort is spent trying to maximize numbers by adjusting things that affect the numbers (such as the timing of registration and exit and employment status at registration) that have no real effect on participant results.

***The employment and earnings measures are inappropriate for postsecondary education programs:*** The proposed employment and earnings measures are designed for programs that enroll unemployed individuals, quickly prepare them for employment, place them in employment, and then attempt to improve earnings. Education programs are not like that. Approximately 70 percent of community and technical

college vocational-technical education students are employed at the time of enrollment. The proposed measure on entered employment includes only participants who are not employed when starting a program. It would thus apply to only 30 percent of the postsecondary students. Many postsecondary programs require licensure prior to employment in their field, and licensure exams are often available only months after program completion. As a consequence, many postsecondary students in the best and most important programs, such as health care, would not be included in the count for the proposed employment retention measure, and their earnings in related employment would not be included in the first of the two proposed earnings increase measures. Also, because such students would not have earnings from employment related to their training until months after exit, their earnings resulting from training would not be captured, at least not fully, in the first of the two proposed earnings increase measures.

The poor fit with postsecondary education is of particular concern because the states' community and technical colleges are the single biggest part of the nation's workforce development system. Another concern is that Washington State and others have implemented Internet-based consumer report systems that enable the public to see the employment and earnings outcomes for all students of particular postsecondary training programs. (The consumer report system is a state effort that began prior to the enactment of WIA, see <http://www.wtb.wa.gov/jtr>.) The measures should work as well as possible for the vast array of offerings at the states' community and technical colleges and private career schools. If states must use different measures for their consumer report systems than they use for the federal common measures it will add complexity and confusion to the states' performance accountability systems for workforce development and increase the frustration and cost for educators and training customers.

***The earnings increase measure has too much variability, too much missing data, too short of a time horizon, and can be misleading:***

The major factor that affects a measure of pre-post earnings change is the level of pre-earnings. For WIA adult services we have found that our initial negotiated targets were considerably off the mark because the program actually enrolled individuals with significantly higher pre-earnings than had occurred under JTPA. For dislocated worker programs, there is a special problem in that the pre-earnings of participants vary greatly from one year to another depending on the industries and occupations experiencing dislocations that year. For particular training programs at individual institutions, there is again a great deal of variability from one year to another in the pre-earnings of program participants.

Another weakness with measures of pre-post earnings change is that for many participants there are no records in wage files for earnings during the pre-period. One cannot tell whether these participants had no earnings during the pre-period or whether they had earnings that are not recorded in the wage files because the earnings were in employment (such as self-employment) not covered by the state's reporting system. From a technical research perspective, an absence of data should be treated as missing data and not counted as zeros or anything else. But doing that disadvantages programs that enroll substantial numbers of participants with no earnings during the pre-period. This is a difficult dilemma to resolve. Technically, the worst way to resolve is to treat missing data as zeros in the pre-period but as missing data in the post period; such a method obviously inflates the results above what they actually are. One way of resolving the dilemma is to simply look at post-program earnings levels.

The second of the proposed earnings increase measures attempts to look at the earnings increase from post-quarter one to post-quarter three. The main thing the measure will capture is the extent to which individuals employed in post-Q3 were employed during only part of post-Q1. In other words, programs will look good to

the extent that their former participants first obtained employment during the later, rather than the early part of Q1. If one is really interested in whether or not individuals have employment that is generating increased earnings over time, post-quarter two should be the earliest starting point, and the time horizon should extend out at least a year from there.

A third weakness in the proposed measure is that earnings change measures can paint a misleading picture of a program's relative effectiveness. Programs will look better the extent to which they serve previously unemployed or very low-income individuals. This can have perverse consequences. Secondary vocational-technical education may appear to be better than postsecondary vocational-technical education. A college program for certified nursing assistants may appear better than a college program for registered nurses if the former enrolls a lot of unemployed individuals and the latter enrolls a lot of dislocated workers. Earnings change measures, therefore, are especially weak as consumer report measures.

Finally, current descriptions of the earnings measure do not make clear whether earnings gain measures apply only to participants who get jobs or to all participants. Restricting the measure to participants who get jobs asks: "How good were the jobs that participants got?" Measuring earnings gain for all participants asks a different question: "How much money did they earn in this period compared to that one?" This approach mixes up the impacts of finding any job at all with the impacts of finding jobs with good hours and wage rates. Early attempts by Workforce Board staff to estimate the proposed earnings gain measures without restricting the measure to participants who had obtained jobs produced nonsensical results that would be of little use in describing program operations to the public or in measuring program performance.

***Efficiency measure does not measure efficiency:*** An efficiency measure is a measure of an input per outcome (or at least output). The proposed mea-

sure only measures the amount of one input (money) per another input (number of participants). It is a cost measure similar to the cost-effectiveness measure discussed earlier in this report. Presumably less is better. The same measure could be labeled "investment" and then presumably more would be better. Washington State measures net outcomes per program cost. That is a true efficiency measure. Research shows that on the average the greater the investment per participant, particularly by investing in occupational skills training, the better the outcome in terms of participant earnings. The proposed measure, therefore, has the perverse effect of incentivizing negative program behavior and not adding to the nation's human capital.

***Educational attainment should be measured:*** In order for the common measures for adults to make sense for a workforce development system that includes education programs, there must be some measure of educational attainment. While the current measure of credentials used by the Department of Labor has not been successful, this does not mean there should be no measure of educational attainment. Perhaps the solution lies in measuring formal degrees and certificates only. It would be ironic if the nation's common measures for workforce development for adults did not include some measure of increased skills.

### *Measures Unique to Youth and Lifelong Learning Programs*

***The placement in employment or education measure makes no sense for secondary vocational-technical education:*** In order for the measure to apply to secondary vocational-technical education, it clearly needs to include individuals who are already enrolled in education when starting the program. As the measure is now written, the numerator and denominator would both be zero for secondary vocational-technical education.

The language does not include return to secondary school as a positive outcome. Returning dropouts to

secondary school is a very positive outcome that should be counted.

The first quarter after exit is too soon to measure placement for two reasons. One, it is not unusual for high school graduates to take off the quarter after graduation before entering employment or postsecondary education. And two, since too many students enroll in a single quarter or semester of postsecondary education and then drop out, a quarter later than post-quarter one would be a better measure of effective postsecondary placement.

**Literacy and numeracy gains:** The language is ambiguous, but may imply that a common assessment instrument would be mandated. While this is a method for consistency across the nation, we anticipate that there will be a great deal of resistance to mandating universal use of a standardize assessment instrument.

**Earnings should be measured:** This is an important omission. Many young people leave youth programs for immediate employment without attending postsecondary education. Approximately one-third of secondary vocational-technical education students fall in this category. Nationwide the number of young people who enter employment without postsecondary education or training is a huge number, an important segment of the labor market, and a segment that needs improved earnings. Improving the earnings of young people who choose to work without attending postsecondary education should be an important goal of workforce development programs and should be measured. Washington State's core indicators for youth include the earnings level of former program participants that are not enrolled in education or training.

**National regression models should be used:** In order to avoid creating disincentives for serving hard to serve populations, the results on the performance measures should be adjusted by national regression models that take participant demographics and local economic conditions into account. Washington State has been able to revise its targets based using state-gener-

ated models. Most states have faced economic downturns, but have not been afforded the opportunity to adjust their WIA targets.

**Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS) should become available to all workforce development programs:** The reliance solely on wage records for measuring employment and earnings will not work unless WRIS becomes available for measuring the performance of all programs.

### Tables

The following data tables make up the third required portion of Washington State's Title I-B Annual Report. A few notes may help with their interpretation. One might expect an annual report to cover results for a year's worth of participants. Federal deadlines and the need for prompt reporting mean that the yearlong periods used for some measures are not the same yearlong periods used in others. In addition, some wage-based measures cannot be supplied for a full year of participants because complete wage records are not yet available.

Federal entered employment rates and employment and credential rates are based on one quarter of follow-up for a full year of participants who exited between October 2000 and September 2001. Federal employment retention rates and earnings change measures are based on three quarters of follow-up for participants who exited between October 2000 and June 2001. The 12-month retention rates and 12-month earnings change measures on Table L are for participants who exited between October 1999 and September 2000. Most of these participants exited prior to July 2000 under JTPA.

Federal real-time measures: customer satisfaction measures (Table A); younger youth skill attainment rates and diploma attainment rates (portions of Tables J and K), and participation levels (Table M) are based on a year running from July 2001 through June 2002.

The numerators and denominators shown to the right of each performance measure show the number of participants or dollars involved in the calculation of each

measure. The Department of Labor uses these numbers to aggregate state results into statistics for performance nationwide. These numbers are smaller than some readers may expect. By definition, Title I-B performance measures apply only to a small fraction of WorkSource participants whose services are funded by Title I-B and who are registered for staff-assisted core, intensive, or training services.

Denominators shown for a given population also change from measure to measure. Some of this occurs because of the different time periods covered by the measures. However, most measures also exclude at least some participants by design. Using adult program measures as an example, federal entered employment rates do not include participants who were employed at registration. Federal retention and earnings gain measures do not include participants unless they were employed during the quarter after exit. Federal employment and credential rates do not include participants unless they received training services.

Washington State has 12 additional measures of performance, nine of which were measured for this program year. Statewide performance on these measures is shown in a set of tables located between Tables M and N. Two of the measures, employment rates and median annualized earnings are based on results in the third quarter after exit. Results are measured for WIA participants who exited between October 2000 and June 2001. Credential rates are also measured for this population. State credential measures are based on the percent of participants who receive credentials within three quarters after exit regardless of whether they received training. This rewards program operators who increase the supply of training services in their areas. Federal measures for adults and dislocated workers are calculated only for those who receive training, and can remain at high levels regardless of the percentage of participants trained.

Table O, attached to this report, supplies performance information for each of Washington's 12 local workforce investment areas. A 13<sup>th</sup> table is supplied to describe results for participants in dislocated worker services funded by Washington's statewide funds who did not receive services funded by any of the local programs. Participants who were co-enrolled in local programs are shown in the appropriate workforce investment area.

Beginning this year, the Department of Labor will collect tabular data through a web-based application. This allows the Department to compile and display results promptly. Washington State has submitted its results electronically in cooperation with this effort. Unfortunately, the Department of Labor system does not have the capacity to show statewide results on additional measures of performance. Table O has space to report only two additional measures of performance per local area. We will summarize local area results on the web-based reporting application. Please refer to the printed version of the tables attached to this report for the full picture.

A panel at the bottom of each page of Table O summarizes the status of performance in the local area. Federal intent was that states place an X in the panel to indicate whether the local area did not meet, met, or exceeded local performance standards. Washington has taken the liberty, instead, of counting the number of measures in these categories. Standards that are "not met" are those where performance is below 80 percent of the negotiated performance level. Standards that are "exceeded" are those where performance is above 100 percent of the negotiated performance level. Standards that are "met" are those where performance ranges from 80 to 100 percent of the levels. As indicated earlier, the local area targets in Table O are regression-adjusted versions of targets negotiated in 1999. The regression adjustments raised or lowered the negotiated targets,

based on the predicted impact of changes in economic and demographic characteristics in each local area.

Performance “exceeded” 208 (65 percent) of the 318 local area targets shown in Table O. Another 82 local area targets were “met”. Only 28 (9 percent) of the local area targets were not met. Caution should be used in interpreting the number of standards not met.

The number of participants on which some measures are based can be small in local areas, particularly for federal youth measures. Eighteen of the 28 results that were not met involved federal youth measures: 14 older youth targets and 4 younger youth targets. Only 5 of the local area targets that were “not met” were based on results for more than 50 participants.

**TABLE A – WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION RESULTS**

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL  AMERICAN CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDEX	# OF COMPLETED SURVEYS	# OF CUSTOMERS ELIGIBLE FOR THE SURVEY	# OF CUSTOMERS INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE	RESPONSE RATE
Participants	75.0	75.9	1,615	6,656	2,683	60.2%
Employers	63.0	68.1	3,043	12,585	3,828	79.5%

**TABLE B – ADULT PROGRAM RESULTS AT-A-GLANCE**

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	73.0%	74.8%	$\frac{884}{1,182}$
Employment Retention Rate	83.0%	79.4%	$\frac{565}{712}$
Earnings Change in Six Months	\$3,440	\$3,752	$\frac{\$2,656,180}{708}$
Employment And Credential Rate	68.0%	66.0%	$\frac{575}{844}$



**TABLE C – OUTCOMES FOR ADULT SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

REPORTED INFORMATION	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS RECEIVING INTENSIVE OR TRAINING SERVICES		VETERANS		INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES		OLDER INDIVIDUALS	
		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	68.5%	$\frac{163}{238}$	73.6%	$\frac{92}{125}$	71.6%	$\frac{146}{204}$	66.7%	$\frac{60}{90}$
Employment Retention Rate	75.2%	$\frac{91}{121}$	82.3%	$\frac{51}{62}$	76.3%	$\frac{90}{118}$	78.9%	$\frac{30}{38}$
Earnings Change in Six Months	\$4,659	$\frac{\$563,791}{121}$	\$3,746	$\frac{\$221,032}{59}$	\$3,518	$\frac{\$411,650}{117}$	\$2,894	$\frac{\$109,967}{38}$
Employment And Credential Rate	63.4%	$\frac{83}{131}$	63.2%	$\frac{55}{87}$	63.1%	$\frac{89}{141}$	52.6%	$\frac{30}{57}$

**TABLE D – OTHER OUTCOME INFORMATION FOR THE ADULT PROGRAM**

REPORTED INFORMATION	INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVED TRAINING SERVICES		INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVED ONLY CORE AND INTENSIVE SERVICES	
		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	76.7%	$\frac{531}{692}$	72.0%	$\frac{353}{490}$
Employment Retention Rate	81.9%	$\frac{375}{458}$	74.8%	$\frac{190}{254}$
Earnings Change in Six Months	\$4,405	$\frac{\$2,004,161}{455}$	\$2,577	$\frac{\$652,019}{253}$
Employment And Credential Rate	66.0%	$\frac{557}{844}$	N/A	$\frac{0}{0}$

**TABLE E – DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM RESULTS AT-A-GLANCE**

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	76.0%	81.8%	$\frac{2,133}{2,608}$
Employment Retention Rate	91.0%	90.6%	$\frac{1,199}{1,324}$
Earnings Replacement in Six Months	86.0%	88.2%	$\frac{\$16,473,220}{\$18,677,629}$
Employment and Credential Rate	69.0%	71.9%	$\frac{1,382}{1,922}$

**TABLE F – OUTCOMES FOR DISLOCATED WORKER SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

REPORTED INFORMATION	VETERANS		INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES		OLDER INDIVIDUALS		DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS	
		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	81.1%	$\frac{416}{513}$	82.9%	$\frac{121}{146}$	70.7%	$\frac{191}{270}$	71.4%	$\frac{15}{21}$
Employment Retention Rate	87.8%	$\frac{216}{246}$	82.9%	$\frac{63}{76}$	90.1%	$\frac{109}{121}$	100.0%	$\frac{10}{10}$
Earnings Replacement Rate	84.6%	$\frac{\$3,325,698}{\$3,931,073}$	69.7%	$\frac{\$686,446}{\$984,387}$	71.2%	$\frac{\$1,351,912}{\$1,899,539}$	129.0%	$\frac{\$109,164}{\$84,603}$
Credential Rate	68.0%	$\frac{257}{378}$	70.0%	$\frac{63}{90}$	61.3%	$\frac{111}{181}$	78.9%	$\frac{15}{19}$

**TABLE G – OTHER OUTCOME INFORMATION FOR THE DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM**

REPORTED INFORMATION	INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVED TRAINING SERVICES		INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVED ONLY CORE AND INTENSIVE SERVICES	
		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	80.6%	$\frac{1,549}{1,922}$	85.1%	$\frac{584}{686}$
Employment Retention Rate	91.0%	$\frac{907}{997}$	89.3%	$\frac{292}{327}$
Earnings Replacement Rate	88.3%	$\frac{\$12,293,439}{\$13,918,544}$	87.8%	$\frac{\$4,179,781}{\$4,759,085}$
Credential Rate	71.9%	$\frac{1,382}{1,922}$	N/A	$\frac{0}{0}$

**TABLE H – OLDER YOUTH RESULTS AT-A-GLANCE**

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	70.0%	69.2%	$\frac{162}{234}$
Employment Retention Rate	74.0%	76.6%	$\frac{108}{141}$
Earnings Change in Six Months	\$2,682	\$2,850	$\frac{\$398,933}{140}$
Credential Rate	47.0%	44.6%	$\frac{123}{276}$

**TABLE I – OUTCOMES FOR OLDER YOUTH SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

REPORTED INFORMATION	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS		VETERANS		INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES		OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH	
		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR		NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Entered Employment Rate	62.5%	$\frac{30}{48}$	100.0%	$\frac{1}{1}$	70.3%	$\frac{26}{37}$	67.2%	$\frac{119}{177}$
Employment Retention Rate	75.9%	$\frac{22}{29}$	100.0%	$\frac{1}{1}$	82.6%	$\frac{19}{23}$	74.8%	$\frac{77}{103}$
Earnings Change in Six Months	\$2,795	$\frac{\$81,056}{29}$	\$2,366	$\frac{\$2,366}{1}$	\$2,718	$\frac{\$62,513}{23}$	\$2,289	$\frac{\$235,807}{103}$
Credential Rate	37.0%	$\frac{20}{54}$	0.0%	$\frac{0}{1}$	27.9%	$\frac{12}{43}$	43.1%	$\frac{88}{204}$

**TABLE J – YOUNGER YOUTH RESULTS AT-A-GLANCE**

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Skill Attainment Rate	60.0%	70.6%	$\frac{2,948}{4,173}$
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	51.0%	64.9%	$\frac{433}{667}$
Retention Rate	60.0%	57.8%	$\frac{234}{405}$



**TABLE K – OUTCOMES FOR YOUNGER YOUTH SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

REPORTED FORMATION	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS		INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES		OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH	
Skill Attainment Rate	69.9%	$\frac{673}{963}$	68.3%	$\frac{415}{608}$	58.4%	$\frac{616}{1,055}$
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	59.3%	$\frac{83}{140}$	75.6%	$\frac{68}{90}$	52.7%	$\frac{177}{336}$
Retention Rate	54.1%	$\frac{46}{85}$	60.0%	$\frac{42}{70}$	57.1%	$\frac{116}{203}$

**TABLE L – OTHER REPORTED INFORMATION**

	12 MONTH EMPLOYMENT RETENTION RATE	12 MONTH EARNINGS CHANGE (ADULTS & OLDER YOUTH) OR 12 MONTH EARNINGS REPLACEMENT (DISLOCATED WORKERS)	PLACEMENTS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN NONTRADITIONAL EMPLOYMENT	WAGES AT ENTRY INTO EMPLOYMENT FOR THOSE WHO ENTERED UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT	ENTRY INTO UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT RELATED TO THE TRAINING RECEIVED OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED TRAINING SERVICES
Adults	77.7% $\frac{1,389}{1,787}$	\$3,827 $\frac{\$6,811,396}{1,780}$	9.2% $\frac{81}{882}$	\$4,225 $\frac{\$3,735,106}{884}$	77.8% $\frac{411}{528}$
Dislocated Workers	87.7% $\frac{2,110}{2,406}$	93.1% $\frac{\$27,828,554}{\$29,897,762}$	7.9% $\frac{166}{2,109}$	\$6,876 $\frac{\$14,515,419}{2,111}$	75.4% $\frac{955}{1,267}$
Older Youth	74.6% $\frac{256}{343}$	\$3,032 $\frac{\$1,030,711}{340}$	10.6% $\frac{17}{161}$	\$2,637 $\frac{\$427,274}{162}$	

**TABLE M – PARTICIPATION LEVELS**

	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED	TOTAL EXITERS
Adults	5,253	2,263
Dislocated Workers	7,827	2,732
Older Youth	1,027	393
Younger Youth	4,619	1,641

**WASHINGTON STATE ADDITIONAL MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE**

*Adult Program*

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Employment Rate	69.4%	66.1%	$\frac{620}{938}$
Median Annualized Earnings	\$16,296	\$15,142	570*
Credential Rate	31.5%	62.6%	$\frac{587}{938}$
Participant Satisfaction	89.0%	N/A**	

*Dislocated Worker Program*

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Employment Rate	76.0%	78.3%	$\frac{1,267}{1,619}$
Median Annualized Earnings	\$24,461	\$24,119	1,178*
Credential Rate	31.2%	71.8%	$\frac{1,163}{1,619}$
Participant Satisfaction	87.0%	N/A**	

*Youth Program*

	NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	NUMERATOR DENOMINATOR
Employment Rate or Further Education	60.4%	79.8%***	$\frac{933}{1,169}$
Median Annualized Earnings	\$7,503	\$6,667	470*
Credential Rate	35.0%	51.4%	$\frac{416}{808}$
Participant Satisfaction	94.0%	N/A**	

\* Number of working participants on which median earnings figures are based.

\*\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

\*\*\* Definition revised to treat youth who remained in secondary education at exit as having "further education".

**TABLE N – COST OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES**

PROGRAM ACTIVITY	TOTAL FEDERAL SPENDING
Local Adults	\$ 16,125,473
Local Dislocated Workers	\$ 17,024,650
Local Youth	\$ 17,862,119
Rapid Response (up to 25%) WIA Sec. 134 (a) (2) (A)	\$ 4,989,884
Statewide Required Activities (up to 15%) WIA Sec.134 (a) (2) (B)	\$ 8,632,778
<b>TOTAL OF ALL FEDERAL SPENDING LISTED ABOVE</b>	<b>\$ 64,634,904*</b>

\* Refer to page 24, Section Two of this report for an overview of the statewide mandatory and optional activities.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

(Includes One Chart for Each Local Area in the State)

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>SOUTHWEST</b> ETA Assigned #53005	Adults	440	
	Dislocated Workers	726	
	Older Youth	51	
	Younger Youth	317	
	<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>		
	Adults	111	
	Dislocated Workers	125	
	Older Youth	13	
	Younger Youth	34	
		<b>NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	79.2
	Employers	64.0	67.6
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	68.0%	75.0%
	Dislocated Workers	74.7%	79.7%
	Older Youth	70.1%	53.3%
Retention Rate	Adults	81.2%	81.3%
	Dislocated Workers	89.5%	89.7%
	Older Youth	70.6%	80.0%
	Younger Youth	54.4%	40.7%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,588	\$4,248
	Dislocated Workers	74.9%	86.8%
	Older Youth	\$3,416	\$2,860
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	67.7%	71.4%
	Dislocated Workers	61.6%	69.2%
	Older Youth	41.7%	12.5%
	Younger Youth	53.0%	50.0%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	57.0%	51.9%
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	66.4%	63.6%
	Dislocated Workers	75.3%	78.7%
	Youth	54.9%	62.0%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$15,397	\$18,380
	Dislocated Workers	\$26,008	\$28,441
	Youth	\$7,107	\$6,852
Credential Rate	Adults	25.1%	63.6%
	Dislocated Workers	32.3%	76.6%
	Youth	47.0%	42.2%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met -3	Met - 6	Exceeded - 17

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED			
<b>OLYMPIC</b> ETA Assigned #53010	Adults	281		
	Dislocated Workers	240		
	Older Youth	82		
	Younger Youth	180		
<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>				
	Adults	138		
	Dislocated Workers	113		
	Older Youth	48		
	Younger Youth	76		
			<b>NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	82.5	
	Employers	63.0	69.5	
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	68.9%	74.7%	
	Dislocated Workers	72.1%	76.2%	
	Older Youth	76.4%	60.0%	
Retention Rate	Adults	76.3%	83.1%	
	Dislocated Workers	88.8%	86.1%	
	Older Youth	74.0%	66.7%	
	Younger Youth	64.9%	70.0%	
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$2,363	\$3,218	
	Dislocated Workers	82.0%	80.4%	
	Older Youth	\$3,073	\$3,226	
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	67.4%	75.4%	
	Dislocated Workers	70.1%	72.5%	
	Older youth	42.9%	28.3%	
	Younger Youth	48.0%	48.1%	
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	68.0%	62.4%	
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>				
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*	
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*	
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*	
Employment in Q3	Adults	61.9%	65.5%	
	Dislocated Workers	71.2%	73.3%	
	Youth	63.0%	73.3%	
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,383	\$16,995	
	Dislocated Workers	\$23,593	\$21,685	
	Youth	\$8,434	\$8,974	
Credential Rate	Adults	36.4%	75.0%	
	Dislocated Workers	28.3%	89.5%	
	Youth	29.4%	45.2%	
Overall Status of Local Performance (Unadjusted)	Not Met -2	Met - 5	Exceeded - 19	

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.



**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
PACIFIC MOUNTAIN ETA Assigned #53015	Adults	598	
	Dislocated Workers	1,005	
	Older Youth	88	
	Younger Youth	389	
<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	253	
	Dislocated Workers	343	
	Older Youth	23	
	Younger Youth	113	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	73.8
	Employers	63.0	64.1
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	74.3%	71.2%
	Dislocated Workers	75.5%	83.5%
	Older Youth	65.1%	88.9%
Retention Rate	Adults	81.2%	67.5%
	Dislocated Workers	91.3%	91.7%
	Older Youth	74.6%	40.0%
	Younger Youth	55.0%	54.2%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,621	\$3,689
	Dislocated Workers	81.0%	89.9%
	Older Youth	\$3,756	\$2,801
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	66.4%	56.4%
	Dislocated Workers	71.0%	79.1%
	Older Youth	35.6%	80.0%
	Younger Youth	43.0%	78.8%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	66.0%	69.4%
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	70.2%	56.3%
	Dislocated Workers	77.3%	83.6%
	Youth	57.2%	60.5%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,662	\$13,994
	Dislocated Workers	\$22,681	\$23,915
	Youth	\$6,831	\$7,937
Credential Rate	Adults	25.0%	57.3%
	Dislocated Workers	38.3%	79.6%
	Youth	27.5%	76.5%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 2	Met - 7	Exceeded - 17

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>NORTHWEST</b> ETA Assigned #53020	Adults	279	
	Dislocated Workers	501	
	Older Youth	62	
	Younger Youth	262	
	TOTAL EXITERS		
	Adults	117	
	Dislocated Workers	212	
	Older Youth	24	
	Younger Youth	156	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	80.9
	Employers	63.0	66.6
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	76.5%	71.6%
	Dislocated Workers	77.1%	82.3%
	Older Youth	68.3%	66.7%
Retention Rate	Adults	85.4%	95.8%
	Dislocated Workers	89.9%	90.9%
	Older Youth	80.5%	85.7%
	Younger Youth	65.0%	73.9%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$4,128	\$7,198
	Dislocated Workers	75.9%	81.5%
	Older Youth	\$3,999	\$5,226
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	68.1%	64.9%
	Dislocated Workers	72.5%	74.3%
	Older Youth	53.4%	38.9%
	Younger Youth	59.0%	35.3%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	63.0%	62.9%
OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	71.6%	79.0%
	Dislocated Workers	78.5%	78.6%
	Youth	62.7%	93.5%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,949	\$17,983
	Dislocated Workers	\$22,918	\$21,298
	Youth	\$7,742	\$9,080
Credential Rate	Adults	36.2%	72.6%
	Dislocated Workers	28.0%	66.1%
	Youth	39.4%	24.4%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met -3	Met - 5	Exceeded - 18

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED			
<b>KING</b> ETA Assigned #53025	Adults	706		
	Dislocated Workers	1,413		
	Older Youth	152		
	Younger Youth	904		
	<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	257		
	Dislocated Workers	175		
	Older Youth	72		
	Younger Youth	452		
			<b>NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	70.1	
	Employers	60.0	66.9	
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	73.2%	68.3%	
	Dislocated Workers	77.2%	82.8%	
	Older Youth	71.7%	61.9%	
Retention Rate	Adults	86.2%	81.0%	
	Dislocated Workers	90.6%	91.9%	
	Older Youth	72.7%	88.9%	
	Younger Youth	61.9%	46.8%	
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,794	\$3,472	
	Dislocated Workers	78.9%	84.8%	
	Older Youth	\$2,561	\$1,598	
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	68.6%	66.3%	
	Dislocated Workers	67.8%	78.2%	
	Older Youth	55.7%	44.4%	
	Younger Youth	51.0%	54.0%	
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54.0%	64.7%	
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>				
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*	
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*	
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*	
Employment in Q3	Adults	74.4%	67.5%	
	Dislocated Workers	76.4%	78.3%	
	Youth	61.4%	89.0%	
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$19,338	\$15,767	
	Dislocated Workers	\$30,551	\$30,463	
	Youth	\$6,580	\$3,695	
Credential Rate	Adults	33.7%	73.5%	
	Dislocated Workers	27.4%	82.8%	
	Youth	39.7%	45.0%	
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met -4	Met -9	Exceeded - 13	

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>SNOHOMISH</b> ETA Assigned #53030	Adults	422	
	Dislocated Workers	469	
	Older Youth	33	
	Younger Youth	237	
<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	134	
	Dislocated Workers	141	
	Older Youth	21	
	Younger Youth	99	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	73.5
	Employers	62.0	68.0
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	77.2%	76.1%
	Dislocated Workers	76.6%	89.4%
	Older Youth	64.0%	50.0%
Retention Rate	Adults	80.1%	66.7%
	Dislocated Workers	91.4%	92.7%
	Older Youth	72.6%	100.0%
	Younger Youth	61.2%	60.0%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$1,713	\$3,053
	Dislocated Workers	75.2%	81.2%
	Older Youth	\$493	\$987
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	69.9%	65.7%
	Dislocated Workers	71.0%	86.1%
	Older Youth	30.0%	12.5%
	Younger Youth	41.0%	62.5%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	65.0%	65.7%
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	69.7%	46.9%
	Dislocated Workers	79.0%	81.3%
	Youth	59.4%	89.5%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$21,371	\$15,399
	Dislocated Workers	\$26,126	\$23,390
	Youth	\$5,990	\$5,158
Credential Rate	Adults	36.8%	40.6%
	Dislocated Workers	30.3%	81.3%
	Youth	31.9%	22.0%
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>	<b>Not Met - 5</b>	<b>Met - 7</b>	<b>Exceeded - 14</b>

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME		TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED	
<b>SPOKANE</b> ETA Assigned #53035	Adults	731	
	Dislocated Workers	826	
	Older Youth	135	
	Younger Youth	310	
<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	376	
	Dislocated Workers	396	
	Older Youth	48	
	Younger Youth	121	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	71.0
	Employers	63.0	67.9
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	80.4%	82.4%
	Dislocated Workers	76.4%	89.6%
	Older Youth	76.9%	80.9%
Retention Rate	Adults	82.9%	70.2%
	Dislocated Workers	90.9%	96.1%
	Older Youth	78.8%	75.0%
	Younger Youth	63.7%	68.4%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,168	\$2,345
	Dislocated Workers	78.8%	91.1%
	Older Youth	\$2,422	\$1,594
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	66.8%	82.7%
	Dislocated Workers	77.1%	84.6%
	Older Youth	67.7%	51.0%
	Younger Youth	59.0%	86.2%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54.0%	89.6%
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	74.2%	59.8%
	Dislocated Workers	81.2%	88.5%
	Youth	64.4%	76.4%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$15,450	\$14,447
	Dislocated Workers	\$23,557	\$24,654
	Youth	\$8,245	\$7,642
Credential Rate	Adults	35.2%	42.2%
	Dislocated Workers	25.9%	43.4%
	Youth	43.2%	69.3%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 3	Met - 6	Exceeded - 17

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>PIERCE</b> ETA Assigned #53040	Adults	224	
	Dislocated Workers	522	
	Older Youth	122	
	Younger Youth	360	
<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	86	
	Dislocated Workers	157	
	Older Youth	29	
	Younger Youth	74	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	75.8
	Employers	61.0	65.7
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	72.0%	61.3%
	Dislocated Workers	78.4%	82.6%
	Older Youth	69.7%	61.9%
Retention Rate	Adults	83.8%	84.4%
	Dislocated Workers	90.5%	88.4%
	Older Youth	72.3%	66.7%
	Younger Youth	64.1%	50.0%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$5,281	\$6,175
	Dislocated Workers	80.9%	88.3%
	Older Youth	\$2,659	\$5,484
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	66.8%	62.3%
	Dislocated Workers	74.1%	72.8%
	Older Youth	45.9%	46.2%
	Younger Youth	58.0%	92.3%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	64.0%	70.5%
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	67.4%	62.0%
	Dislocated Workers	78.8%	73.9%
	Youth	64.0%	63.0%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$16,089	\$16,514
	Dislocated Workers	\$26,804	\$27,397
	Youth	\$7,894	\$14,925
Credential Rate	Adults	39.6%	86.0%
	Dislocated Workers	36.2%	67.2%
	Youth	32.1%	67.9%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 1	Met - 9	Exceeded - 16

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>NORTH CENTRAL</b> ETA Assigned #53045	Adults	599	
	Dislocated Workers	410	
	Older Youth	103	
	Younger Youth	567	
	TOTAL EXITERS		
	Adults	282	
	Dislocated Workers	197	
	Older Youth	57	
	Younger Youth	197	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	77.6
	Employers	65.0	70.4
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	74.2%	80.7%
	Dislocated Workers	78.5%	83.4%
	Older Youth	69.2%	76.5%
Retention Rate	Adults	82.7%	83.5%
	Dislocated Workers	88.6%	96.3%
	Older Youth	74.8%	76.5%
	Younger Youth	64.3%	56.0%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,176	\$3,240
	Dislocated Workers	85.8%	82.7%
	Older Youth	\$3,036	\$2,893
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	69.6%	64.3%
	Dislocated Workers	62.5%	70.6%
	Older Youth	33.6%	57.5%
	Younger Youth	47.0%	65.7%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54.0%	84.0%
OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	69.0%	75.9%
	Dislocated Workers	73.9%	87.6%
	Youth	63.5%	63.5%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$16,343	\$14,579
	Dislocated Workers	\$19,215	\$16,550
	Youth	\$8,305	\$9,672
Credential Rate	Adults	30.0%	62.8%
	Dislocated Workers	21.8%	69.0%
	Youth	33.3%	57.9%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met -0	Met - 6	Exceeded - 20

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>TRI-COUNTY</b> ETA Assigned #53050	Adults	401	
	Dislocated Workers	507	
	Older Youth	105	
	Younger Youth	477	
	TOTAL EXITERS		
	Adults	163	
	Dislocated Workers	129	
	Older Youth	27	
	Younger Youth	126	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	82.7
	Employers	65.0	68.9
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	77.6%	76.7%
	Dislocated Workers	74.5%	78.6%
	Older Youth	73.9%	88.9%
Retention Rate	Adults	81.4%	79.7%
	Dislocated Workers	89.3%	89.4%
	Older Youth	71.9%	77.8%
	Younger Youth	51.1%	65.5%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,978	\$3,498
	Dislocated Workers	79.9%	102.9%
	Older Youth	\$2,406	\$2,894
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	66.5%	67.1%
	Dislocated Workers	73.6%	73.3%
	Older Youth	57.8%	72.7%
	Younger Youth	49.0%	57.6%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	59.0%	74.7%
OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*
Employment in Q3	Adults	68.9%	64.5%
	Dislocated Workers	77.4%	78.9%
	Youth	56.6%	71.1%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,583	\$11,797
	Dislocated Workers	\$22,540	\$23,675
	Youth	\$8,437	\$9,911
Credential Rate	Adults	25.5%	54.8%
	Dislocated Workers	22.8%	80.7%
	Youth	33.2%	66.7%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 0	Met - 6	Exceeded - 20

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.



**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED			
EASTERN WASHINGTON ETA Assigned #53055	Adults	333		
	Dislocated Workers	348		
	Older Youth	44		
	Younger Youth	367		
	<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>			
	Adults	188		
	Dislocated Workers	194		
	Older Youth	21		
	Younger Youth	146		
			<b>NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	75.7	
	Employers	66.0	74.5	
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	72.7%	74.0%	
	Dislocated Workers	74.6%	80.2%	
	Older Youth	66.3%	63.2%	
Retention Rate	Adults	76.2%	80.3%	
	Dislocated Workers	90.7%	88.2%	
	Older Youth	79.9%	92.3%	
	Younger Youth	50.7%	57.8%	
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3,566	\$4,624	
	Dislocated Workers	88.4%	110.5%	
	Older Youth	\$2,249	\$3,764	
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	67.8%	66.7%	
	Dislocated Workers	59.2%	70.1%	
	Older Youth	46.3%	47.8%	
	Younger Youth	60.0%	79.0%	
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54.0%	77.8%	
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>				
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A*	
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A*	
	Youth	94.0%	N/A*	
Employment in Q3	Adults	65.8%	69.9%	
	Dislocated Workers	74.3%	75.2%	
	Youth	54.9%	72.2%	
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,752	\$12,853	
	Dislocated Workers	\$20,392	\$22,643	
	Youth	\$6,357	\$6,555	
Credential Rate	Adults	27.5%	72.0%	
	Dislocated Workers	38.2%	68.9%	
	Youth	26.5%	65.4%	
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 0	Met - 4	Exceeded - 22	

\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>BENTON-FRANKLIN</b> ETA Assigned #53060	Adults	241	
	Dislocated Workers	225	
	Older Youth	50	
	Younger Youth	249	
	TOTAL EXITERS		
	Adults	158	
	Dislocated Workers	123	
	Older Youth	10	
	Younger Youth	46	
		NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	73.8
	Employers	62.0	64.4
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	80.4%	75.0%
	Dislocated Workers	73.0%	77.8%
	Older Youth	80.2%	100.0%
Retention Rate	Adults	80.3%	79.4%
	Dislocated Workers	91.1%	80.0%
	Older Youth	86.0%	N/A*
	Younger Youth	67.6%	42.9%
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$2,795	\$2,424
	Dislocated Workers	92.1%	68.7%
	Older Youth	\$3,600	N/A*
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	69.0%	52.0%
	Dislocated Workers	68.1%	77.3%
	Older Youth	53.7%	50.0%
	Younger Youth	53.0%	57.7%
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	73.0%	67.6%
OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	89.0%	N/A**
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A**
	Youth	94.0%	N/A**
Employment in Q3	Adults	74.1%	67.4%
	Dislocated Workers	68.4%	47.1%
	Youth	67.0%	80.0%
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	\$14,752	\$14,828
	Dislocated Workers	\$25,056	\$16,732
	Youth	\$6,585	\$5,363
Credential Rate	Adults	25.2%	39.5%
	Dislocated Workers	8.9%	47.1%
	Youth	36.9%	46.7%
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met - 5	Met - 9	Exceeded - 10

\* No participants qualified for this measure during the time period evaluated.

\*\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE**

LOCAL AREA NAME	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS SERVED		
<b>STATEWIDE DISLOCATED WORKER*</b>  ETA Assigned #53903	Adults	N/A	
	Dislocated Workers	639	
	Older Youth	N/A	
	Younger Youth	N/A	
	<b>TOTAL EXITERS</b>		
	Adults	N/A	
	Dislocated Workers	428	
	Older Youth	N/A	
	Younger Youth	N/A	
<hr/>			
		<b>NEGOTIATED PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ACTUAL PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b>
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75.0	67.6
	Employers	N/A	N/A
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	76.0%	81.8%
	Older Youth	N/A	N/A
Retention Rate	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	91.0%	90.6%
	Older Youth	N/A	N/A
	Younger Youth	N/A	N/A
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	86.0%	88.2%
	Older Youth	N/A	N/A
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	69.0%	71.9%
	Older youth	N/A	N/A
	Younger Youth	N/A	N/A
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	N/A	N/A
<hr/>			
<b>OTHER STATE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE</b>			
Customer Satisfaction	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	87.0%	N/A**
	Youth	N/A	N/A
Employment in Q3	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	76.0%	75.4%
	Youth	N/A	N/A
Median Annualized Earnings	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	\$24,461	\$25,616
	Youth	N/A	N/A
Credential Rate	Adults	N/A	N/A
	Dislocated Workers	31.2%	43.4%
	Youth	N/A	N/A
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>	<b>Not Met - 0</b>	<b>Met - 3</b>	<b>Exceeded - 5</b>

\* Includes only those Dislocated Workers not co-enrolled in locally funded programs.

\*\* State participant satisfaction questions were not asked in PY01.

## WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table A: Workforce Investment Act Customer Satisfaction Results**

Customer Satisfaction	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance - Level - American Customer Satisfaction Index	Number of Surveys Completed	Number of Customers Eligible for the Survey	Number of Customers Included in the Sample	Response Rate
Participants	75	75.9	1,615	6,656	2,683	60.2
Employers	63	68.1	3,043	12,585	3,828	79.5

**Table B: Adult Program Results At-A-Glan**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Entered Employment Rate	73	74.8	884
			1,182
Employment Retention Rate	83	79.4	565
			712
Earnings Change in Six Month	3,440	3,752	2,656,180
			708
Employment and Credential Rate	68	68.1	575
			844

**Table C: Outcomes for Adult Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients Receiving Intensive or Training Services		Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals	
Entered Employment Rate	68.5	163	73.6	92	71.6	146	66.7	60
		238		125		204		90
Employment Retention Rate	75.2	91	82.3	51	76.3	90	78.9	30
		121		62		118		38
Earnings Change in Six Months	4,659	563,791	3,746	221,032	3,518	411,650	2,894	109,967
		121		59		117		38
Employment and Credential Rate	63.4	83	63.2	55	63.1	89	52.6	30
		131		63		141		57

**Table D: Other Outcome Information for the Adult Program**

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Only Received Core and Intensive Services	
Entered Employment Rate	76.7	531	72	353
		692		490
Employment Retention Rate	81.9	375	74.8	190
		458		254
Earnings Change in Six Months	4,405	2,004,161	2,577	652,019
		455		253

**Table E: Dislocated Worker Program Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
		Rate	Count
Entered Employment Rate	76	81.8	2,133
			2,608
Employment Retention Rate	91	90.6	1,199
			1,324
Earnings Replacement in Six Months	86	88.2	16,473,220
			18,677,629
Employment and Credential Rate	69	71.9	1,382
			1,922

**Table F: Outcomes for Dislocated Worker Special Populations**

Reported Information	Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals		Displaced Homemakers	
	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count
Entered Employment Rate	81.1	416	82.9	121	70.7	191	71.4	15
		513		146		270		21
Employment Retention Rate	87.8	216	82.9	63	90.1	109	100	10
		246		76		121		10
Earnings Replacement Rate	84.6	3,325,698	69.7	686,446	71.2	1,351,912	129	109,164
		3,931,073		984,387		1,899,539		84,603
Employment And Credential Rate	68	257	70	63	61.3	111	78.9	15
		378		90		181		19

**Table G: Other Outcome Information for the Dislocated Worker Program**

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Received Core and Intensive Services	
	Entered Employment Rate	80.6	1,549	85.1
1,922			686	
Employment Retention Rate	91	907	89.3	292
		997		327
Earnings Replacement Rate	88.3	12,293,439	87.8	4,179,781
		13,918,544		4,759,085

**Table H: Older Youth Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
		Entered Employment Rate	70
Employment Retention Rate	74	76.6	234
			108
Earnings Change in Six Months	2,682	2,850	398,933
			140
Credential Rate	47	44.6	123
			276

**Table I: Outcomes for Older Youth Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients		Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Out-of-School Youth	
	Entered Employment Rate	62.5	30 48	100	1 1	70.3	26 37	67.2
Employment Retention Rate	75.9	22 29	100	1 1	82.6	19 23	74.8	77 103
Earnings Change in Six Months	2,795	81,056 29	2,366	2,366 1	2,718	62,513 23	2,289	235,807 103
Credential Rate	37	20 54	0	0 1	27.9	12 43	43.1	88 204

**Table J: Younger Youth Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level		Actual Performance Level	
	Skill Attainment Rate	60	70.6	2,948 4,173
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	51	64.9	433 667	
Retention Rate	60	57.8	234 405	



**Table K: Outcomes for Younger Youth Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients		Individuals Disabilities		Out-of-School Youth	
Skill Attainment Rate	69.9	673	68.3	415	58.4	616
		963		608		1,055
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	59.3	83	75.6	68	52.7	177
		140		90		336
Retention Rate	54.1	46	60	42	57.1	116
		85		70		203

**Table L: Other Reported Information**

	12 Month Employment Retention Rate		12 Mo. Earnings Change (Adults and Older Youth) or 12 Mo. Earnings Replacement (Dislocated Workers)		Placements for Participants in Nontraditional Employment		Wages At Entry Into Employment For Those Individuals Who Entered Employment Unsubsidized Employment		Entry Into Unsubsidized Employment Related to the Training Received of Those Who Completed Training Services	
Adults	77.7	1,389	3,827	6,811,396	9.2	81	4,225	3,735,106	77.8	411
		1,787		1,780		882		884		528
Dislocated Workers	87.7	2,110	93.1	27,828,554	7.9	166	6,876	14,515,419	75.4	955
		2,406		29,897,762		2,109		2,111		1,267
Older Youth	74.6	256	3,032	1,030,711	10.6	17	2,637	427,274		
		343		340		161		162		

**Table M: Participation Levels**

	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Total Exiters</b>
<b>Adults</b>	<b>5,253</b>	<b>2,263</b>
<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	<b>7,827</b>	<b>2,732</b>
<b>Older Youth</b>	<b>1,027</b>	<b>393</b>
<b>Younger Youth</b>	<b>4,619</b>	<b>1,641</b>

**Table N: Cost of Program Activities**

<b>Program Activity</b>		<b>Total Federal Spending</b>
<b>Local Adults</b>		<b>\$16,125,473.00</b>
<b>Local Dislocated Workers</b>		<b>\$17,024,650.00</b>
<b>Local Youth</b>		<b>\$17,862,119.00</b>
<b>Rapid Response</b> (up to 25%) 134 (a) (2) (A)		<b>\$4,989,884.00</b>
<b>Statewide Required Activities</b> (up to 25%) 134 (a) (2) (B)		<b>\$8,632,778.00</b>
<b>Statewide Allowable Activities</b> 134 (a) (3)	<b>Program Activity Description</b>	
<b>Total of All Federal Spending Listed Above</b>		<b>\$64,634,904.00</b>

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Benton-Franklin Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	241
		Dislocated Workers	225
		Older Youth	50
		Younger Youth	249
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	158
		Dislocated Workers	123
		Older Youth	10
		Younger Youth	46

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	73.8
	Employers	62	64.4
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	80.4	75
	Dislocated Workers	73	77.8
	Older Youth	80.2	100
Retention Rate	Adults	80.3	79.4
	Dislocated Workers	91.1	80
	Older Youth	86	0
	Younger Youth	67.6	42.9
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,795	2,424
	Dislocated Workers	92.1	68.7
	Older Youth (\$)	3,600	0
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	69	52
	Dislocated Workers	68.1	77.3
	Older Youth	53.7	50
	Younger Youth	53	57.5
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	73	67.6
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	5
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	2
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		5	9
		<b>Exceeded</b>	10

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Eastern Washington Partnership Workforce Dev. Council	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	333
		Dislocated Workers	348
		Older Youth	44
		Younger Youth	367
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	188
		Dislocated Workers	194
		Older Youth	21
		Younger Youth	146

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	75.7
	Employers	66	74.5
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	72.7	74
	Dislocated Workers	74.6	80.2
	Older Youth	66.3	63.2
Retention Rate	Adults	76.2	80.3
	Dislocated Workers	90.7	88.2
	Older Youth	79.9	92.3
	Younger Youth	50.7	57.8
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,566	4,624
	Dislocated Workers	88.4	110.5
	Older Youth (\$)	2,249	3,764
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	67.8	66.7
	Dislocated Workers	59.2	70.1
	Older Youth	46.3	47.8
	Younger Youth	60	79
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54	77.8
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	8
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		0	4
		<b>Exceeded</b>	22

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> North Central Washington Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	599
		Dislocated Workers	410
		Older Youth	103
		Younger Youth	567
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	282
		Dislocated Workers	197
		Older Youth	57
		Younger Youth	197

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	77.6
	Employers	65	70.4
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	74.2	80.7
	Dislocated Workers	78.5	83.4
	Older Youth	69.2	76.5
Retention Rate	Adults	82.7	83.5
	Dislocated Workers	88.6	96.3
	Older Youth	74.8	76.5
	Younger Youth	64.3	56
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,176	3,240
	Dislocated Workers	85.8	82.7
	Older Youth (\$)	3,036	2,893
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	69.6	64.3
	Dislocated Workers	62.5	70.6
	Older Youth	33.6	57.5
	Younger Youth	47	65.7
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54	84
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	7
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		0	6
		<b>Exceeded</b>	20

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Northwest Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	279
		Dislocated Workers	501
		Older Youth	62
		Younger Youth	262
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	117
		Dislocated Workers	212
		Older Youth	24
		Younger Youth	156

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	80.9
	Employers	63	66.6
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	76.5	71.6
	Dislocated Workers	77.1	82.3
	Older Youth	68.3	66.7
Retention Rate	Adults	85.4	95.8
	Dislocated Workers	89.9	90.9
	Older Youth	80.5	85.7
	Younger Youth	65	73.9
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	4,128	7,198
	Dislocated Workers	75.9	81.5
	Older Youth (\$)	3,999	5,226
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	68.1	64.9
	Dislocated Workers	72.5	74.3
	Older Youth	53.4	38.9
	Younger Youth	59	35.3
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	63	62.9
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	7
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	1
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		3	5
		<b>Exceeded</b>	18

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

Local Area Name: Olympic Workforce Development Council	Total Participants Served	Adults	281
		Dislocated Workers	240
		Older Youth	82
		Younger Youth	180
	Total Exiters	Adults	138
		Dislocated Workers	113
		Older Youth	48
		Younger Youth	76

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	82.5
	Employers	63	69.5
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	68.9	74.7
	Dislocated Workers	72.1	76.2
	Older Youth	76.4	60
Retention Rate	Adults	76.3	83.1
	Dislocated Workers	88.8	86.1
	Older Youth	74	66.7
	Younger Youth	64.9	70
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,363	3,218
	Dislocated Workers	82	80.4
	Older Youth (\$)	3,073	3,226
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	67.4	75.4
	Dislocated Workers	70.1	72.5
	Older Youth	42.9	28.3
	Younger Youth	48	48.1
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	68	62.4
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	8
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		2	5
			<b>Exceeded</b>
			19

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Pacific Mountain Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	598
		Dislocated Workers	1,005
		Older Youth	88
		Younger Youth	389
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	253
		Dislocated Workers	343
		Older Youth	23
		Younger Youth	113

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	73.8
	Employers	63	64.1
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	74.3	71.2
	Dislocated Workers	75.5	83.5
	Older Youth	65.1	88.9
Retention Rate	Adults	81.2	67.5
	Dislocated Workers	91.3	91.7
	Older Youth	74.6	40
	Younger Youth	55	54.2
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,621	3,689
	Dislocated Workers	81	89.9
	Older Youth (\$)	3,756	2,801
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	66.4	56.4
	Dislocated Workers	71	79.1
	Older Youth	35.6	80
	Younger Youth	43	78.8
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	66	69.4
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	7
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		2	7
		<b>Exceeded</b>	17



# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Seattle-King County Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	706
		Dislocated Workers	1,413
		Older Youth	152
		Younger Youth	904
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	257
		Dislocated Workers	175
		Older Youth	72
		Younger Youth	452

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	70.1
	Employers	60	66.9
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	73.2	68.3
	Dislocated Workers	77.2	82.8
	Older Youth	71.7	61.9
Retention Rate	Adults	86.2	81
	Dislocated Workers	90.6	91.9
	Older Youth	72.7	88.9
	Younger Youth	61.9	46.8
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,794	3,472
	Dislocated Workers	78.9	84.8
	Older Youth (\$)	2,561	1,598
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	68.6	66.3
	Dislocated Workers	67.8	78.2
	Older Youth	55.7	44.4
	Younger Youth	51	54
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54	64.7
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	5
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	1
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		4	9
		<b>Exceeded</b>	13

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Snohomish County Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	422
		Dislocated Workers	469
		Older Youth	33
		Younger Youth	237
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	134
		Dislocated Workers	141
		Older Youth	21
		Younger Youth	99

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	73.5
	Employers	62	68
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	77.2	76.1
	Dislocated Workers	76.6	89.4
	Older Youth	64	50
Retention Rate	Adults	80.1	66.7
	Dislocated Workers	91.4	92.7
	Older Youth	72.6	100
	Younger Youth	61.2	60
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	1,713	3,053
	Dislocated Workers	75.2	81.2
	Older Youth (\$)	493	987
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	69.9	65.7
	Dislocated Workers	71	86.1
	Older Youth	30	12.5
	Younger Youth	41	62.5
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	65	65.7
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	4
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	3
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		5	7
		<b>Exceeded</b>	14

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Southwest Washington Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	440
		Dislocated Workers	726
		Older Youth	51
		Younger Youth	317
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	111
		Dislocated Workers	125
		Older Youth	13
		Younger Youth	34

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	79.2
	Employers	64	67.6
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	68	75
	Dislocated Workers	74.7	79.7
	Older Youth	70.1	53.3
Retention Rate	Adults	81.2	81.3
	Dislocated Workers	89.5	89.7
	Older Youth	70.6	80
	Younger Youth	54.4	40.7
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,588	4,248
	Dislocated Workers	74.9	86.8
	Older Youth (\$)	3,416	2,860
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	66.7	71.4
	Dislocated Workers	61.6	69.2
	Older Youth	41.7	12.5
	Younger Youth	53	50
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	57	51.9
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	6
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		3	6
		<b>Exceeded</b>	17

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Spokane Area Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	731
		Dislocated Workers	826
		Older Youth	135
		Younger Youth	310
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	376
		Dislocated Workers	396
		Older Youth	48
		Younger Youth	121

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	71
	Employers	63	67.9
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	80.4	82.4
	Dislocated Workers	76.4	89.6
	Older Youth	76.9	80.9
Retention Rate	Adults	82.9	70.2
	Dislocated Workers	90.9	96.1
	Older Youth	78.8	75
	Younger Youth	63.7	68.4
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,168	2,345
	Dislocated Workers	78.8	91.1
	Older Youth (\$)	2,422	1,594
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	66.8	82.7
	Dislocated Workers	77.1	84.6
	Older Youth	67.7	51
	Younger Youth	59	86.2
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	54	89.6
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	6
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		3	6
		<b>Exceeded</b>	17

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> StateWide Dislocated Workers-53888	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	0
		Dislocated Workers	639
		Older Youth	0
		Younger Youth	0
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	0
		Dislocated Workers	428
		Older Youth	0
		Younger Youth	0

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	67.6
	Employers	0	0
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	0	0
	Dislocated Workers	76	81.8
	Older Youth	0	0
Retention Rate	Adults	0	0
	Dislocated Workers	91	90.6
	Older Youth	0	0
	Younger Youth	0	0
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	0	0
	Dislocated Workers	86	88.2
	Older Youth (\$)	0	0
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	0	0
	Dislocated Workers	69	71.9
	Older Youth	0	0
	Younger Youth	0	0
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	0	0
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 3 State Measures Exceeded		3	2
Number of 3 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		0	3
		<b>Exceeded</b>	5

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Tacoma-Pierce County Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	224
		Dislocated Workers	522
		Older Youth	122
		Younger Youth	360
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	86
		Dislocated Workers	157
		Older Youth	29
		Younger Youth	74

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	75.8
	Employers	61	65.7
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	72	61.3
	Dislocated Workers	78.4	82.6
	Older Youth	69.7	61.9
Retention Rate	Adults	83.8	84.4
	Dislocated Workers	90.5	88.4
	Older Youth	72.3	66.7
	Younger Youth	64.1	50
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	5,281	6,175
	Dislocated Workers	80.9	88.3
	Older Youth (\$)	2,659	5,484
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	66.8	62.3
	Dislocated Workers	74.1	72.8
	Older Youth	45.9	46.2
	Younger Youth	58	92.3
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	64	70.5
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	6
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		1	9
		<b>Exceeded</b>	16

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: WA

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Tri-County Workforce Development Council	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	401
		Dislocated Workers	507
		Older Youth	105
		Younger Youth	477
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	163
		Dislocated Workers	129
		Older Youth	27
		Younger Youth	126

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	75	82.7
	Employers	65	68.9
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	77.6	76.7
	Dislocated Workers	74.5	78.6
	Older Youth	73.9	88.9
Retention Rate	Adults	81.4	79.7
	Dislocated Workers	89.3	89.4
	Older Youth	71.9	77.8
	Younger Youth	51.1	65.5
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,978	3,498
	Dislocated Workers	79.9	102.9
	Older Youth (\$)	2,406	2,894
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	66.5	67.1
	Dislocated Workers	73.6	73.3
	Older Youth	57.8	72.7
	Younger Youth	49	57.6
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	59	74.7
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>			
Number of 9 State Measures Exceeded		9	7
Number of 9 State Measures Not Met		0	0
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>
		0	6
		<b>Exceeded</b>	20